AN

EXPOSITION

Of the ~~Holy Doctrine~~

DOCTRINE

OF THE

Catholic Church

In Matters of

CONTROVERSIE.

By the Right Reverend

JAMES BENIGNE BOSSUET,

Counsellor to the King, Bishop of *Meaux*; formerly of *Condom*, and Preceptor to the *Dauphin*; First Almoner to the *Dauphiness*.

Done into *English* with all the former Approbations, and others newly published in the Ninth and last Edition of the *French*.

Published by his Majesties Command.

LONDON, Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty, for His Houshold and Chappel. 1686.

EDMUND MADDEN's Book,
HIGH-STREET, KILKENNY.

*** BOOKS are a guide to youth, and an entertainment in old age; they support us under ſolitude, and keep us from being a burthen to ourſelves.

KILKENNY: Printed by G. O'NEILL.

M.DCC LXXX.

THE APPROBATION

Of the Right Reverend the ARCHBISHOPS and BISHOPS.

WE have read the Treatiſe intituled, An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church in Matters of Controverſie, Compoſed by the Right Reverend *James Benigne Boſſuet*, Biſhop and Lord of *Condom*, Preceptor to His Royal Highneſs the *Dauphin*. *And we declare, That after having examined it, with as much Application as the Importance of the Matter required, we have found the Doctrine contained in it conformable to the Catholic, Apoſtolic and* Roman *Faith. And therefore we think our ſelves obliged to propoſe it, as ſuch, to thoſe whom God has committed to our Charge. We are certain, the Faithful will be edified by it; and we hope thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, who read this Work with attention, will receive from it ſo right an Underſtanding as may conduce to put them into the Way of Salvation.*

CHARLES MAURICE LE TELLIER, *Archbiſhop and Duke of* Reims.
CH. DE ROSMADEC, *Biſhop of* Tours.
FELIX, *Biſhop and Earl of* Chalons.
DE GRIGNAN, *Biſhop of* Uſez.
D. DE LIGNY, *Biſhop of* Meaux.
NICHOLAS, *Biſhop of* Auxerre.
GABRIEL, *Biſhop of* Autun.
MARC, *Biſhop of* Tarbe.
ARMAND JOHN, *Biſhop and Prince of* Grenoble.
JULIUS, *Biſhop of* Tule.

A Table of Articles contained in this Treatise.

I. *Design of this Treatise.* Pag. 1

II. *Those of the Pretended Reform'd Religion acknowledge, The Catholic Church embraces all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.* 2

III. *Religious Worship is terminated only in God.* 4

IV. *Invocation of Saints.* 5

V. *Images and Reliques.* 8

VI. *Justification.* 10

VII. *Merits of Good Works.* 11

VIII. *Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences.* 14

IX. *Sacraments.* 16

Baptism. 17

Confirmation. ibid.

Pennance and Sacramental Confession. 18

Extream Unction. ibid.

Marriage. ibid.

Holy Orders. 19

X. *Doctrine of the Church touching the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of* JESUS CHRIST *in the Eucharist, and how the Church understands these Words,* This is my Body. ibid.

XI. *Explication of these Words,* Do this in remembrance of me. 21

XII. *Explication of the Doctrine of the* Calvinists, *concerning the Real Presence.* 23

XIII. *Of Transubstantiation, and Adoration, and in what sense the Eucharist is a Sign.* 28

XIV. *Sacrifice of the Mass.* 29

XV. *Epistle to the* Hebrews. 31

XVI. *Reflections upon the precedent Doctrins.* 33

XVII. *Communion under both Species.* 35

XVIII. *Written, and unwritten Word.* 36

XIX. *Authority of the Church.* 37

XX. *Opinions of the Pretended Reform'd upon the Authority of the Church.* 39

XXI. *Authority of the Holy See, and of Episcopacy.* 42

XXII. *Conclusion of this Treatise.* 43

Ap-

Approbations never before publiſhed.

A Second Brief of our Holy Father the POPE, upon the *EXPOSITION* as now publiſhed with an Advertiſment.

VEnerabilis Frater, Salutem & Apoſtolicam Benedictionem. Accepimus libellum de Catholicæ fidei Expoſitione, quem pia, eleganti, ſapientique ad Hæreticos in viam ſalutis reducendos, oratione auctum reddi nobis curavit Fraternitas tua. Et quidem libenti animo confirmamus uberes laudes quas tibi de præclaro opere meritò tribuimus, & ſuſceptas ſpes copioſi fructûs exinde in Eccleſiam profecturi. Quamquam a preſtantiſſima diſciplina, qua egregiam DELPHINI indolem continenter excolis, auſpicari imprimis juvat ingentia Catholicæ Religionis incrementa: magna enim cum nominis tui laude in abſolutum religioſiſſimi ac ſapientiſſimi Principis exemplar in dies magis ipſum inſtitui, conſtantis famæ teſtimonio undique comprobari intelligimus. Ex quo opportunum, inter tot Chriſtianæ Reipublicæ mala & pericula, graviſſimis curis noſtris ſolatium haurimus: quas etiam non parum levant novæ, eæque præclaræ filialis obſervantiæ ſignificationes, quas literis ſeptima Junii ad nos datis conſignaſti, in quibus priſcum illum ſanctorum Galliæ Epiſcoporum ſpiritum, ſenſuſque apertè deprehendimus. Quæ vero vicißim ſit erga te voluntas noſtra, & quo in pretio habeamus perſpectas virtutes tuas, præcipuis, ubi ſe offerat occaſio, Pontificiæ benevolentiæ documentis, teſtatum tibi facere non omittemus, Venerabilis Frater, cui interim Apoſtolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimur. Datum Romæ apud Sanctam Mariam Majorem, ſub annulo Piſcatoris, die XII. *Julii* M. DC. LXXIX. *Pontificatûs noſtri anno* III.

MARIUS SPINULA.

And endorſed: *Venerabili Fratri* JACOBO BENIGNO *Epiſcopo Condomenſi.*

Extrait

Extrait des Actes de l'Aſſemblée Generale du Clergé de France de M. DC. LXXXII. *concernant la Religion*, Monſeigneur l'Archeveſque de Paris Préſident.

Imprimez en la meſme année chez Leonard Imprimeur du Clergé: Titre, *Memoire contenant les differentes Methodes dont on peut ſe ſervir tres-utilement pour la converſion de ceux qui font profeſſion de la Religion prétendue Réformée*; dreſſé dans cette Aſſemblée, & envoyé par toutes les Provinces avec l'avertiſſement Paſtoral de l'Egliſe Gallicane.

LA *dixiéme Methode eſt celle de M. l'Eveſque de Meaux, cy-devant Eveſque de Condom, dans ſon Livre intitulé*, Expoſition de la Doctrine de l'Egliſe Catholique: *par laquelle, en démeſlant ſur chaque article ce qui eſt préciſément de la Foy de ce qui n'en eſt pas, il fait voir qu'il n'y a rien dans noſtre créance qui puiſſe choquer un eſprit raiſonnable, à moins que de prendre pour noſtre créance des abus de quelques particuliers que nous condamnons, ou des erreurs qu'on nous impute tres-fauſſement, ou des explications de quelques Docteurs, qui ne ſont pas receûes ni autoriſés de l'Egliſe.*

The

The Second Brief of our Holy Father

POPE *INNOCENT* XI.

VEnerable Brother, Health and Apoſtolical Benediction. We have received the little Treatiſe of the *Expoſition of the Catholic Faith*, together with that Pious, Elegant, and Judicious Diſcourſe, ſo proper to recal Heretics into the way of Salvation, which you have added to it, and taken care to ſend Us. And We do willingly reiterate thoſe great Praiſes We have deſervedly given you, for this Excellent Work, and the Hopes We have of the great Fruit the Church will daily reap thereby. But above all, We expect the greateſt Advancement of the Catholic Religion from your continual Application to cultivate the happy *Genius* of the *Dauphin* of *France*: For We hear from all Parts, by the conſtant Teſtimony of Fame, of the wonderful Progreſs of this Prince, who by your Care, and to your Glory, becomes daily a perfect Model of Piety and Wiſdom: Which gives Us great Conſolation, and very ſeaſonable, amidſt the weighty Cares with which We are afflicted, conſidering the Evils ſuffered by the Catholic Church, and the Dangers with which ſhe is threatned: To the eaſing of which Cares you have alſo contributed, by the Illuſtrious Teſtimony you have given Us of your Filial Obedience, in your Letter of the Seventh of *June*, in which We clearly diſcover that ancient Spirit and thoſe Sentiments with which the Holy Biſhops of the *Gallican* Church were formerly endowed. For Our parts, We can aſſure you, Venerable Brother, that when Occaſion ſhall offer it ſelf, you ſhall find, by the moſt particular Marks of Our Good-will, the Affection We have for you, and the Eſteem We have conceived of your eminent Vertues. And in the mean

mean time We do moſt affectionately give you Our Apoſtolical Benediction. Given at *Rome*, at *St. Mary Major*, under the Fiſher's Ring, the Twelfth of *July*, M.DC.LXXIX. and the Third of Our Pontificate.

Signed *MARIUS SPINULA.*

And endorſed, *To Our Venerable Brother*, JAMES BENIGNE *Biſhop of* Condom.

Extracted out of the Acts of the General Aſſembly of the Clergy of France, *in the Year* 1682. *concerning Religion; the Right Reverend the Lord Archbiſhop of* Paris *being Preſident.*

Printed the ſame Year by *Leonard*, Printer to the Clergy, Entituled, *A Memorial containing the different Methods which may be very profitably made uſe of for the Converſion of thoſe who profeſs the Pretended Reform'd Religion*; drawn up by this Aſſembly, and ſent throughout all Provinces, together with a Paſtoral Advertiſement of the *Gallican* Church.

THe Tenth Method is that of the Biſhop of *Meaux*, formerly Biſhop of *Condom*, in his Book intituled, *An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*: In which, by ſeparating upon every Article what is preciſely of Faith, from that which is not, he ſhews, there is nothing in our Belief which can offend Men of Reaſon, unleſs they will take, in ſtead of our Doctrines, the Abuſes of ſome Particulars, whom we condemn, or the Errors falſly imputed to us, or the Explications of ſome Doctors, which are neither received nor authoriſed by the Church.

AN ADVERTISEMENT

Upon Account of This Preſent Edition.

Catholick Doctrine

ONE would have thought, thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, in reading this Treatiſe, ſhould at leaſt have granted, The Doctrine of the Church was faithfully expounded in it. The leaſt they could have allowed a Biſhop, was to have underſtood his own Religion, and to have ſpoke without diguiſe, in a Matter, where to diſſemble would be a Crime. But nevertheleſs, it has fallen out otherwiſe. This Treatiſe, whilſt a Manuſcript, was made uſe of to inſtruct ſeveral particular Perſons, and many Copies of it were diſperſed. Upon which the ſincerer part of the pretendly Reform'd were almoſt every where heard to ſay, That if it were approv'd, it would in reality take away great difficulties; But that the Author durſt never publiſh it, and if he ſhould, he would not eſcape the Cenſure of all thoſe of his Communion, particularly that of *Rome*, which would not frame it ſelf to his Maxims. After ſome time, nevertheleſs, this Book, thus condemned to a perpetual obſcurity, appeared uſhered in with the Approbation of ſeveral Biſhops; And the Author, who knew very well he had only expreſſed in it the Mind of the Council of *Trent*, apprehended not thoſe Cenſures threatned by the Reformers.

It was not certainly probable the Catholic Faith ſhould be betray'd, in ſtead of being expounded, by a Biſhop; who, after having preached the Goſpel all his Life-time, without the leaſt ſuſpicion of his Doctrine, had been newly called to inſtruct a Prince, whom the greateſt King in the World, and the moſt zealous Defender of the Religion of his Anceſtor, cauſes to be educated in ſuch a manner, that he may be one day one of its principal Supports. But theſe Gentlemen of the Pretended Reformation ceaſed not to perſevere in their firſt Opinion. They expected every moment when Catholics ſhould oppoſe this Book, and *Rome* it ſelf condemn it.

The occaſion of this their imagination was, that the major part, who

know nothing of our Doctrine, but as represented to them by their Ministers under the most hideous Ideas, know it not again when shown in its natural Dress. So that it was no hard task to represent the Author of the Exposition to them, as one who molified the Sentiments of his Religion, and sought out proper and qualifying Moderations to content all Parties.

There has appeared two Answers to this Treatise. The Author of the first would not discover his Name, and till he himself be pleased to declare it, we will not reveal the Secret. It is enough to us, that this Work was approved by the Ministers of *Charenton*, and sent to the Author of the Exposition by the late *M. Conrart*, one endowed with all that Catholics could desire in a Man, excepting a better Religion. The other Answer was written by *M. Noguier* a Minister, who is amongst them of great repute, and has the esteem of an able Divine. They both pretended the Exposition was contrary to the Decisions of the Council of *Trent*. They both affirm the very Design it self, of Expounding the Doctrine of the Council, to be prohibited by the *Pope*: and they both take care to say, that *M. de Condom* do's only mince and extenuate the Doctrine of his Religion. As they represent him, one would think that he relents, that he is coming over to them, that he abandons the Sentiments of his own Church, and embraces those of the Pretended Reform'd. In fine, His Treatise agrees not with that Profession of Faith which the *Roman Church* proposes to all those who are of her Communion, and they represent him at defiance with every Article.

M. Claude, de Langle, Daille, & Alix.

An p 3. 112, 113, 124, 137, &c.

Nog. p. 63, 94, 95, 109, 110.

An. p. 10.

Nog. p. 40.

Nog. p. 20, 27.

An. Avert. p. 24.

If we believe the *Anonymus*, this Prelate is come to a fair Composition about *Transubstantiation*. He is willing to content himself with such a Reality of the Body of *JESUS CHRIST* in the Sacrament as the Pretended Reform'd themselves believe. When he treats of the Invocation of Saints, *He endeavours to mitigate and extenuate this Worship of the Roman Church*, both as to her Tenets and Practice. Together with the Veneration of Saints, *he softens that of Images, as also the Articles of Satisfaction, Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Pope's Authority.* As for Images, *he is ashamed of the Excess to which the Doctrine as well as the Practice has been carried.* The *Anonymus*, who represents him as if he had changed the Council of *Trents* Exposition in the Article of Satisfaction, will needs have it, *that this change in the Expression proceeds from an Alteration which he introduces in the Doctrine.* In fine, he represents him as one who is going over to the Sentiments of the New Reformation; or, to use his own Expression, *like the Dove which returns to the Ark, not finding where to rest his foot.*

Rep. p. 3.

An p. 137.

Nog. p. 94.

An. Avert. p. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29.

An. Avert, p. 27.

An. p 24.

An. Avert. p. 24.

An. p. 65.

An. p. 114.

P. 110.

An. p 104, 368.

He not only lays to his charge particular Opinions about the Merits of Good Works, and the Authority of the Pope; but seems ready, if we would conform our selves to the Doctrine of the Exposition, to admit the two Articles which so much perplex those of his Communion.

There

There is nothing generally more frequently repeated in his Book, than the Reproaches he caſts upon the Author of the Expoſition, for deſerting the *Communion of the Church of Rome*, he wiſhes all thoſe of *M. de Condom's* Communion would reduce themſelves to the Moderations in this Book, and write conformably to its ſenſe. This would (ſays he a little after) be a happy beginning of a Reformation, which might have much more happy Conſequences. An. Avert. p. 23, 26. Rep. p. 3, &c. An. Avert. p. 30.

Nay more, he takes an advantage from theſe pretended Alleviations. *Theſe Softnings of* M. de Condom (ſays he) *are ſo far from giving us an ill Opinion of our Reformation, they confirm us that good and moderate Perſons themſelves condemn (at leaſt a great deal) that we do, and by conſequence in ſome meaſure acknowledge a Reformation to be uſeful and neceſſary.* An p. 85.

He ſhould have concluded quite otherwiſe. For a Reformation, ſuch as theirs is, which tends to a change in Doctrine, ought not to regard thoſe things which are condemned already by common conſent. But the Pretended Reform'd are willing to perſwade themſelves, the *Honeſt* and *moderate Perſons* in Communion with *Rome*, amongſt which number they allow *M. de Condom* a place, in many things abandon the Sentiments of their Church, and come over as much as they can to the New Reformation.

Thus you ſee what they are made believe by this ſtrange manner of miſ-repreſenting the Catholic Doctrine. Being accuſtomed to that hideous and terrible Form in which their Miniſters repreſent it in their Pulpits, they imagine thoſe Catholics who lay it open in its natural Purity, diſguiſe and alter it: The more juſtly we repreſent it as it is, the leſs are they acquainted with it; and they imagine we are going over to them, when we only diſabuſe them of their falſe Preoccupations.

'Tis true, they ſay not always the ſame thing. The *Anonymus*, who accuſes *M. de Condom* of making ſuch conſiderable Alterations in the Doctrine of the Church, tells us, *this Expoſition has nothing new in it, but a dextrous and delicate turn, aud, in fine, nothing but apparent qualifying, which Conſiſting only in ſome Expreſſions, or in things of ſmall conſequence, gives no body any ſatisfaction, and only raiſes new Difficulties, inſtead of reſolving old.* P. 61, 62.

So that he ſeems to be ſorry for having repreſented the Expoſition as a Book which made an alteration in the Faith of the Church in all its principal Points, not only in the Expreſſions, but in the Doctrine.

Let him take it which way he pleaſes. If he continue to think a Book, ſo truly Catholic as the Expoſition, contrary to ſo many important Points of the *Roman* Faith, he ſhows himſelf never to have had any thing but falſe Idea's of its Doctrine. And if it be true, that by ſweetning only the Expreſſions, or retrenching, as he ſays, matters of ſmall conſequence, the Catholic Doctrine ſeems to him ſo much

more tractable, he will in the end find the Grounds of it were better than he imagined.

But the truth of the matter is, *M. de Condom* has not betrayed his Conſcience, nor diſſembled the Faith of the Church, in which the Holy Ghoſt has placed him Biſhop; And the Pretended Reform'd could not perſwade themſelves that a Doctrine which already appears leſs ſtrange by the ſole Expoſition of it, and that an Expoſition ſo plain, ſo eaſie, and ſo ſhort, ſhould be that Doctrine which their Miniſters repreſented to them full of Blaſphemy and Idolitrous.

We ought, no doubt, to give God thanks for ſuch a diſpoſition, becauſe although it ſhew in them a ſtrange prejudice againſt us, yet it gives us hopes they will look upon our Tenets with a more equal temper, when once they are ſatisfied that the Doctrine of this Treatiſe, which ſeems to them already more pleaſing, is the pure Doctrine of the Church. So that we are ſo far from being angry at them for making ſo great a difficulty to believe us when we propoſe our Faith to them, that we are obliged in Charity to give them Lights ſo clear and evident, that they may not hereafter doubt but it was faithfully expounded to them. The thing ſhews it ſelf, and we need but tell them how this Treatiſe of the Expoſition, which they believe is contrary *not only to the common Tenets of the Doctors of the Roman Church, but alſo to the words and Doctrine of the Council*, is approved by the whole Church; and that after having received divers Teſtimonies of Approbation from *Rome*, as well as from other places, it has at laſt been approved by the Pope himſelf in the moſt expreſs and moſt Authentick manner that could be expected.

An. p. 3.

This Book had no ſooner appeared in publick, but the good repute it had throughout *France* was teſtified to the Author by Letters from all ſorts of People, from Lay-Perſons, Eccleſiaſticks, Religious, and Doctors, but eſpecially from the moſt Learned Prelates of the Church, whoſe Teſtimonies he could even then have produced, had the Subject been ever ſo little dubious or new.

But becauſe the Pretended Reform'd are apt to believe us in *France* to have particular thoughts and Tenets which approach nearer theirs in matters of Faith, than the reſt of the Church, and particularly than *Rome*: It is convenient we ſhould let them ſee how matters were there carried on.

As ſoon as this Treatiſe was come forth, Cardinal *Bouillon* ſent it to Cardinal *Bona*, deſiring him to examine it with the utmoſt Rigour. Letters could no ſooner return from *Rome* to *Paris*, but there came alſo from this Learned and Holy Cardinal, whoſe Memory will be perpetuated in the Church with eternal Benedictions, that honourable approbation of his, which you will find in the ſequel among the reſt that we ſhall ſpeak of.

The

The Book was Printed the firſt time about the end of the year 1671. And this Cardinals anſwer is dated the 26. *Jenuary*, 1672.

Cardinal *Sigiſmond*, whoſe death the whole Church doth ſtill regret, writ no leſs favourably concerning it, to *M. L'Abbe de Dangeau*. He tells us expreſly, that *M. de Condom* has ſpoken very well of the Popes Authority; and whereas this Abbot had written him word, that ſome ſcrupulous perſons here apprehended leſt this Expoſition ſhould be looked upon at *Rome*, as one of thoſe Explications of the Council prohibited by Pope *Pius* IV, he ſhews how ill grounded this ſcruple is. He adds, that he found the Maſter of the Sacred Palace, the Secretary, and the Conſulters of the Congregation *dell' Indice*, all the Cardinals that compoſe it, and in particular the Learned Cardinal *Brancas* Preſident of it of the ſame opinion, and that they did all of them highly applaud this Treatiſe of the Expoſition. This Letter bears date the 5*th*. of *April*, 1672.

The Reverend Father *Hyacinth Libelli* a famous Divine, whoſe Merits and great Learning raiſed him ſhortly after to the Dignity of Archbiſhop of *Avignon*, was at that time Maſter of the Sacred Palace. His Letter of the 26*th*, of *April*, 1672. Written to his E. the Cardinal *Sigiſmond*, ſhews what eſteem he had of this Book; for he tells him, there is not ſo much as *the ſhadow of a fault in it, and that if the Author deſire it ſhould be Printed at* Rome, *he will give all the neceſſary Permiſſions, without altering the leaſt tittle in it.*

In effect *M. l' Abbe Nazari*, famous for the *Journal des Scavans* which he writes with ſo much elegance and exactneſs, was at that time about an *Italian* Verſion of it, which his E. the Cardinal *d'Eſtrees* cauſed to be reviewed, and did himſelf peruſe ſome of the Principal parts, that it might be entirely conformable to the original.

The Book had been already done into *Engliſh* by the late Abbot *Montague*, whoſe zeal and vertue is known to the whole World, and there wanted not ſeveral Teſtimonies to ſhew that this Verſion was well received by all the Catholics of *England*. This Tranſlation was Printed in the Year 1672; and in the Year 1675. it was put into *Iriſh*, and Printed at *Rome* by the Printers of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*.

The Author of this Verſion, Reverend Father *Porter*, of the Holy Order of St. *Francis*, and Superiour of the Convent of St. *Iſidorus*, had ſome time before ordered a Book called *Securis Evangelica* to be Printed at *Rome* it ſelf, in which a great part of this Treatiſe of the Expoſition was inſerted, to prove the Tenets of the Church, when faithfully expounded, are ſo far from ruining the Foundations of Faith, that they eſtabliſh them.

In the mean time the *Italian* Verſion went on with an exactneſs which became a Subject of that importance, where one Word ill rendred, would

ſpoil

ſpoil the whole Work; and the Reverend Father *Capiſucchi*, Maſter of the *Sacred Palace*, Licenſed it to be Printed in the Year 1675, as appears by his Anſwer of the 27*th.* of *June* following, to *M. de Condom*'s Letter of thanks for it.

This Prelate, after having heard from ſeveral parts of *Germany*, how this Treatiſe had been well approved of there, received a more ample Teſtimony of it in a Letter of the 27*th* of *April*, 1673, from the Biſhop and Prince of *Paderborn*, then *Coadjutor*, and at preſent Biſhop of *Munſter*; in which that Prelate, whoſe name bears with it his *Elogium*, ſays, that he took care this work ſhould be turned into *Latin*, that it might be made common every where, and eſpecially in *Germany*: but the ſucceeding Wars, or ſome other occupations having hindred the performance of it, the Biſhop of *Caſtory*, *Apoſtolical Vicar* in the United Provinces, was deſirous that a *Latin* Verſion, which the Author himſelf had examined, might be made publick, and accordingly it was Printed at *Antwerp* in the Year 1678.

Not long after, in the ſame Year, by the ſame Biſhop's order, this Treatiſe was again Printed at *Antwerp* in *Dutch*, with the Approbation of the Ordinary, and the Doctors in thoſe Parts, ſo very profitable did this Prelate, who compoſes ſuch excellent things himſelf, judge this to be for the Inſtruction of his People.

The Biſhop of *Strasbourgh*, who, notwithſtanding the miſeries of War, was no leſs careful of his Flock, reſolved, about the ſame time, to procure that this Book might be turned into *High Dutch*, and publiſhed with a Paſtoral Letter to all thoſe of his Dioceſs; and having advertiſed the Pope of his Deſign, his Holineſs cauſed him to be informed, That *he knew the Book long before; and that as he had heard from all Parts it was the occaſion of many Converſions, ſo the Tranſlation of it could not but be advantageous to his People.*

About this time the *Italian* Verſion was finiſhed with all the exactneſs and elegancy poſſible. Monſieur *l'Abbe Nazari* dedicated it to the Cardinals of the Congregation *de Propaganda Fide*, by whoſe Order it was printed in the ſame Year 1678. by the Printers belonging to that Congregation.

In the Front of this Verſion was placed Cardinal *Bona*'s Letter, the Copy of which was found at *Rome*, in the Hands of his Secretrary, as alſo the Approbation of *M. l'Abbe Ricci*, Conſultor of the Holy Office; of Reverend Father *M. Laurence Brancati de Laurea*, Religious of the the Order of St. *Francis*, Conſultor and Qualificator of the Holy Office, and Bibliothecarian of the *Vatican*; and of *M. l'Abbe Gradi*, Conſultor of the Congregation *dell' Indice*, and Bibliothicarian of the *Vatican*: that is, by the chief Men in *Rome* for Piety and Learning.

This Book was preſented to the Pope, as the *Latin* Tranſlation had been before. And he had the goodneſs to order *M. l'Abbe de St Luke* to write to the Author, and to let him know that he was ſatisfied with it;

it; which he alſo repeated ſeveral times to the *French* Embaſſador.

The Author, who thought he had nothing more to wiſh for, after ſuch an Approbation, gave, with a profound Reſpect, his moſt humble Thanks to the Pope, in a Letter dated *Nov.* 22. 1678. In anſwer to which, he received a Breve from his Holineſs of the Fourth of *Jan.* 1679. which contains ſuch an expreſs approbation of this Book, that it cannot be hereafter doubted, but it maintains the pure Doctrine of the Church, and of the Apoſtolick See.

After this Approbation, I needed not to have mentioned any others; but I was willing to ſhew how this Book, which was threatned by the Miniſters with ſuch oppoſition in the Church, and which they imagined was ſo contrary to her *common Doctrine*, has naturally (as I may ſay) paſſed through all the degrees of Approbation, till it came to that of the Pope himſelf, which confirms all the reſt.

Thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, may at preſent ſee how they were impoſed upon, when they were told, *The Perſon was known, and that a Catholic too, who writ againſt this Expoſition of* M. de Condom. An. Avert. p. 23. It would certainly be a ſtrange thing, this good Catholic, unknown to all all others of that Religion, ſhould make the Enemies of the Church his only Confidents in a Work which he deſigned againſt a Biſhop of his own Communion. But this Imaginary Writer makes the World ſtay too long, and the Pretended Reform'd are too credulous, if they ſuffer themſelves hereafter to be amuſed by ſuch like Promiſes.

Thus one of the neceſſary Queſtions to be anſwered in vindication of the Expoſition is entirely diſpatch'd. We need not now go about to refute thoſe Miniſters who held the Doctrine of the Expoſition not to be that of the Church. Time and Truth have ſo refuted their allegations, that no room is left for a Reply.

M. Noguier would firſt hear the Oracle of *Rome* ſpeak, before he would admit *M. de Condom* to have rightly explicated the *Catholic Faith. I give no credit* (ſays he) *to thoſe Approbations, which theſe Biſhops give in Writing. Other Doctors want not the like Approbations, and after all, the Oracle of* Rome *muſt ſpeak in matters of Faith.* The *Anonymus* was of the ſame Mind, and both of them ſuppoſed nothing more could be ſaid in this matter againſt *M. de Condom*, if once this Oracle had but ſpoken. This Oracle has now ſpoken; this Oracle, I ſay, which the whole Catholic Church hearkened to with ſo much reſpect in the very origine of Chriſtianity; and the Anſwer it has given, has ſhewn, that what this Prelate has ſaid, has nothing new, or to be ſuſpected in it, nothing, in a word, which is not receiv'd throughout the whole Church. P. 41.

Nay, this Queſtion being anſwered, all the others are in a manner inſenſibly diſpatcht.

M. de Condom held, the Catholic Doctrine was never rightly underſtood by the pretended Reform'd; and that the Authors of their Separation

tion had magnified the Objects to render them odious. What he ſaid, appears now moſt certain, ſeeing it is manifeſt on the one ſide, the Expoſition propoſes to them the Catholic Faith, in its purity; and on the other, that it appeared leſs ſtrange to them than they thought it was.

But if they find their Pretended Reformers, to the end they might animate them againſt that Church, in which their Anceſtors ſerved God, and in which they themſelves received Baptiſm, were forced to fly to thoſe Calumnies which we ſee now are not maintainable, how can they diſpenſe with themſelves if they ſearch not a new? And why are they not afraid to perſiſt in a Schiſm, which is manifeſtly founded upon falſe Principles, in even the moſt principal points?

They believ'd, for example, they had good grounds to ſeparate from the Church, under pretence, that whilſt ſhe taught the merit of good Works, ſhe deſtroy'd Free Juſtification, and that Confidence which a Chriſtian ought to have in *JESUS CHRIST* only.

Gratuite.

Their breach was principally founded upon this Article. The *Anonymus* thinks it enough to ſay, *The Article concerning Juſtification is one all of the chief, that gave occaſion to the Reformation.* But M. *Noguiers* ſpeaks more plainly. *Thoſe* (ſays he) *who were the Authors of our Reformation had reaſon to propoſe the Article of Juſtification, as the moſt principal of all the reſt, and the moſt Eſſential Foundation of their ſeparating.* At preſent then, ſeeing *M. de Condom* tells them, together with the whole Church, *that ſhe believes we cannot have Life, but in Jeſus Chriſt, in whom alone ſhe puts all her Hope: That ſhe asks all things, hopes all things, and gives thanks for all things, through our Lord JESUS CHRIST: and in fine, that ſhe places all the hopes of Salvation in him:* What would they have more?

An. p. 86.

Nog. p. 83.

Expoſ. p. 12.

Expoſ. p. 13.

The Church tells us, *That all our Sins are pardon'd by pure Mercy through JESUS CHRIST, That we owe that Juſtice which is in us, by the Holy Ghoſt, to his free undeſerved liberality; and that all our good Works which we do, are ſo many gifts of his Grace.* The Author of this Expoſition, who teaches this Doctrine, do's not teach it as his own; God forbid. He teaches it as the clear and manifeſt Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*; and the Pope approves his Book. After this ſhall it be again ſaid, That the Council of *Trent*, and the *Roman* Church overthrow Free Juſtification, and that truſt which the Faithful ought to repoſe in *JESUS CHRIST* alone? Is not this unſufferable? And if we ſhould hold our Tongues? would not the Stones cry aloud, and proclaim us injur'd?

Ibid. p. 13.

Expoſ p. 13.

It muſt be alſo granted, as it was taken notice of in the Expoſition, that thoſe Diſputes which the Pretended Reform'd have raiſed upon ſo capital a Point, are almoſt brought to nothing, not to ſay wholly refuted. No body will doubt of it, if they conſider what the *Anonymus* has writ concerning the Merit of Good Works with the approbation of four Miniſters of *Charenton*. *We acknowledge* (ſays he) *as in Juſtice we muſt, that* M. de Condom, *and thoſe of the* Roman *Church, who hold the moſt*

An p. 104.

Orthodox

Orthodox Opinions concerning Grace, expreſs themſelves almoſt in all things as we do. We agree with them in the main. But ſince he promiſed us ſo much Juſtice, he ought to have acknowledged, that *M. de Condom*, whom he makes here to be of a particular Sect, has not ſaid one word concerning the merit of Good Works, which is not taken from the Council. He ſaid, *Eternal Life ought to be propoſed to the Children of God, both as a Grace which is mercifully promiſed to them by the means of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, and as a Recompence which is faithfully rendred to their Good Works, and to their merits, in vertue of that Promiſe.* He ſaid, *That Merits are the gifts of God.* He ſaid, *We can do nothing of our ſelves, but that we can do all things with him who ſtrengthens us, and that our whole Confidence is in JESUS CHRIST.* And the reſt, which you may ſee in their proper place. By this means it is he has ſatisfied the Pretended Reform'd, and made them ſay, they agree with him in *the main.* Seeing therefore theſe Propoſitions are taken word by word from the Council, they cannot hereafter but acknowledge the *Principal* Subject of their complaints to be taken away, by the ſole propoſing the Decrees and proper Terms of a Council ſo much hated and blamed amongſt them. Expoſ. p. 11. 12. 13.

What is it offends them moſt in the Satisfactions which the Church exacts from the Faithful, but only that they think *Catholics* look upon thoſe of *JESUS CHRIST* as unſufficient? Will they deny their Catechiſms, and Confeſſions of Faith, to be grounded upon this foundation? What will they now ſay, when the Author of the Expoſition tells them, with the whole Church, *That Jeſus Chriſt, God and Man, was ſolely capable by the infinite Dignity of his Perſon, to offer up to God a Sufficient Satisfaction for our Sins: That this Satisfaction is infinite; That our Saviour has Payed the entire Price of our Redemption; That nothing is wanting to this Price, ſeeing it is infinite; and that the Puniſhments reſerv'd, ſuffered in Pennance, come not from any defect in the Payment, but from a certain Order, which he has eſtabliſhed to reſtrain us, by juſt fears, and by a ſaving Diſcipline?* Theſe and all thoſe otherExpreſſions which make the *Anonymus* ſay, this Author *Extenuates* the Doctrine of Satisfaction, and *returns like the Dove to the Ark*, are the pure Doctrines of the Church, and of the Council of *Trent*, acknowledged for ſuch by the Pope himſelf. Why therefore will they make People believe the Church looks upon that as an aid to the Satisfactions of *Jeſus Chriſt*, which ſhe propoſes as a means only to apply it? And with what ſecurity of Conſcience could the Pretended Reform'd, upon ſuch falſe ſuppoſitions, violate that Holy Unity, which *JESUS CHRIST* has ſo much recommended to his Church? Expoſ. p. 14. &. ſeq.

They look upon our Sacrifice of the Altar with Horror, as if *JESUS CHRIST* were again put to Death upon it. What has the Author of the Expoſition done to diminiſh this horror ſo unjuſt, but only repreſented Expoſ. p. 29. 30.

repreſented the Doctrine of the Church faithfully? He has told them this Sacrifice is of ſuch a nature, as it admits only a myſtical and Spiritual Death of our adorable Victim, who remains always impaſſible and immortal; and is ſo far from diminiſhing the infinite Perfection of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, *It is eſtabliſhed only to celebrate the remembrance of it, and to apply the Vertue.* The *Anonymus* aſſures us upon this account, that *M. de Condom*, minces the Doctrine of the Catholic Church: And *M. Noguier* alſo aſſures us, he has not expoſed the Truth. And yet he has only followed the Doctrine of the Council, whoſe proper Terms he has made uſe of; and the whole Church approves his Expoſition. Who do's not therefore perceive how this Doctrine appears to the Pretended Reform'd more moderate and agreeable, only becauſe they do not find thoſe Monſters in it, which they imagine to themſelves?

Nog p. 286. Ex. p. 31.

The *Anonymus* himſelf tells us, *The Article of Invocation of Saints is one of the moſt Eſſential in Religion.* It is alſo one of thoſe, wherein *M. de Condom* ſeems to him *chiefly to ſoften the Doctrine of his Church*; for he accuſes him of it no leſs than three times. But what has *M. de Condom* ſaid? the ſame the Catechiſm of the Council of *Trent* ſaid, the ſame the Council it ſelf, and the Confeſſion of Faith drawn from it has ſaid, and the ſame which all Catholics ſay: *That the Saints offer their Prayers for us*; Is what the Confeſſion of Faith ſays: *That they offer them by JESUS CHRIST*; Is what the Council ſays: In a word, That we pray to them with the ſame Mind we pray to *our Brethren, who are upon Earth with us, that is, to Pray with us, and for us, to our Common Maſter, in the name of our Common Mediator, who is Jeſus Chriſt.* Behold what *M. de Condom* has Extracted out of the Council, out of the Catechiſm, and out of all the publick Acts of the Church, the reaſon his Doctrine has been ſo much approved.

An. p. 61. An. p. 24. Rep. p. 24, 35.

Expoſ. p. 5. &. ſequ.

Expoſ. p. 6.

This anſwer is ſufficient to ruine the very Grounds of that horror, which the Pretended Reform'd have conceived againſt our Doctrine.

Their Catechiſm accuſes us of *Idolatry, becauſe, by that recourſe we have to Saints, we place one part of our Truſt in them, and give to them what God has reſerv'd to himſelf.*

Catech. dim. 34.

But on the contrary, it appears, that when we pray to Saints, we Pray to them only to pray for us; a kind of Prayer, which by its own Nature, is ſo far from being reſerved to himſelf by God, who is an independent Being, that it can never be addreſs'd to him.

And if this form of Prayer, *Pray for us*, diminiſhed the truſt we have in God, it would be no leſs condemnable to uſe it to the living, than to the dead; and St. *Paul* would not have ſaid ſo often *Brethren Pray for us.* The whole Scripture is full of Prayers of this Nature.

1 Theſ. 5. 25. 2. 3. 1. Heb. 13. 18.

But (ſays their Confeſſion of Faith) this is to overthrow the Mediation of J. C. *who commands us to retire our ſelves in private, and to pray*

Conf. Art. 24.

to

to his Father in his Name. How can any one imagine this, ſeeing neither the Saints, who are in Heaven, nor the Faithful upon Earth, make interceſſions by and through themſelves, or in their own Names; but only in the Name of *Jeſus Chriſt*, as all Catholics teach with the Council? Ep. p. 6.

Thus the Catholic Church has only to declare, as ſhe do's, her intention never was to demand any thing of the Saints, but their humble Prayers in the name of *Jeſus Chriſt*, of like Nature with thoſe the Faithful offer up for one another upon Earth; theſe few Words will convince for ever the pretendedly Reform'd, of having born her a moſt unjuſt hatred.

But *M. Neguier* declares, *Let M. de Condom ſay what he will, he will never be perſwaded, the* Roman *Church has no other intention (when ſhe tells us, it is Profitable to invocate the Saints) but that we ſhould ask them the aſſiſtance of their Prayers, as we do thoſe of the Faithful, who live amongſt us.* But what will he ſay, now he ſees the *Roman* Church ſo viſibly approve what *M. de Condom* had in effect only gathered from the Univerſal belief of thoſe in Communion with her? But *why then*, adds *M. Noguier, Do Catholics ask not only the Prayers, but the Aid, Protection, and Succour of the bleſſed Virgin, and of the Saints?* As if that were not a kind of *Aid, Succour, and Protection*, to recommend the miſerable to him, who alone can comfort them. Such is the protection we may receive from the Bleſſed Virgin and from the Saints. It is not a ſmall Succour to be aided by their Prayers, ſeeing they are at the ſame time ſo humble, ſo pleaſing, and ſo efficacious. But why ſhould we argue about words, where the thing is ſo evident? The Expoſition produces to theſe Miniſters moſt certain Teſtimonies, by which it is manifeſt, *that in what Terms ſoever the Prayers we offer to the Saints be couched, the Intention of the Church, and of the Faithful always reduces them to this Form, PRAY FOR US.* No matter for that, the Miniſters *will never believe it.* They muſt then raze out of their Catechiſm, and their Confeſſion of Faith, theſe accuſations of Idolatry, with which they are filled; they muſt retrench in their Sermons ſo many bloody Invectives, which have no other Grounds, and this they cannot reſolve on; and let us make what Declarations we can of our Minds, they will neither believe the Council, nor its Catechiſm, nor our Confeſſion of Faith, nor the Biſhops, nor the Pope himſelf. Nog. p. 54. Nog. p. 57. Expoſ. p. 6,

It is not neceſſary to repeat here what is ſaid in the Expoſition as to other objections, and principally as to that where they accuſe the Church of attributing to Saints a Divine Knowledge and Power, whilſt ſhe teaches, they can neither know nor do any thing of themſelves. Exp. p 6. 7.

But the accuſation of Idolatry has another Foundation, which they accuſe *M. de Condom to have palliated* as well as the others. And it is the Article concerning Images, where nevertheleſs he has ſearched An. Av. p, 24. Rep. p. 65.

no other Palliations, but to expoſe faithfully the meaning of the Church.

There needs no more than this to make the very Suſpition of Idolatry to vaniſh, according to the Principles of the Pretended Reform'd; and they need only in this compare the Doctrine of their own Catechiſm with that of the Council of *Trent*, repreſented in the Expoſition.

Dim. 23. Their Catechiſm upon this Commandment. *Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any Graven Image*, Asks whether God *forbids the making of any Image?* And the anſwer is, *No, but that God forbids only the making of any Image whereby to repreſent God or to adore it.* Behold the two things which they think forbidden in this Precept of the Decalogue.

It may be they will do us the Juſtice to believe we do not pretend to repreſent God, and that, if they ſee in ſome Pictures God the Father Painted in that form which he was pleaſed ſo often to appear in to his Prophets, we pretend no more to derogate from his Inviſible and Spiritual Nature, than he himſelf when he exibited himſelf under that form. The Council explicates ſufficiently to them upon this account,

Seſſ. 25. *that we pretend not thereby to repreſent or expreſs the Divinity, or to give it any Colours*; and I think I ſhould do them an injury in proceeding to a clearer Proof.

Let us paſs to the Second part of their Doctrine, and let us Learn from their Catechiſms *what form of Adoration is condemned. To Proſtrate ones ſelf*, ſays the Anſwer, *before an Image, to pray to it, to bow the Knee before it, or ſhew ſome other ſign of reverence, as if God exhibited himſelf there to us.* This is in effect the Errour of the Gentiles, and the proper Character of Idolatry. But they who believe, with the Coun-

Expoſ. p. 8. 9. 10. cil, *That Images have neither Divinity nor Vertue in them, for which they ought to be reverenced*, and who place all the benefit, in their recalling the Originals to our remembrance, do not believe that God in them *exhibits himſelf to them.* It is not therefore Idolatry, by the conſent of the Pretended Reform'd, and according to the proper Definition of their Catechiſm.

The *Anonymus* ſeems to have been ſenſible of this Truth in that place, where objecting this commandment of the Decalogue, he ſays,

p. 67. that God *forbids to make Images, and to Worſhip them.* He is in the right. The words of the Precept are expreſs, and the Images there ſpoken of are thoſe which are forbidden to be *made* as well as to be *worſhipped.* That is to ſay, according to the explication of his Catechiſm, *thoſe which are made to repreſent God, and thoſe which are made to ſhow him preſent*, and which are worſhipped with the ſame intention as full of his Divinity. We neither make nor ſuffer any of this nature. We do not Worſhip Images; God forbid: But we make uſe of Images, to put us in mind of the Originals. Our Council, ſo odious to the Pretended Reform'd Church, teaches us no other uſe of them: Is this then

enough

enough to make them ſay, as that Church doth in her own Confeſſion of Faith, *that all ſorts of Idolatry are in vogue in the Roman Church?* Is it for this her Diſcipline calls us *Idolaters*, and our Religion *Idolatry?* Without doubt they repreſent to themſelves other things than our Doctrine, when they give us the name of Gentiles: They believe we follow their abominable Errors, and that we believe as they did, that God ſhews himſelf to us in thoſe Images. Art. 28. Diſc. art. 11. 13. Art. iv. 2.

Had it not been for theſe mortal Prejudices, had it not been for theſe horrid Idea's which they frame to themſelves of the ſentiments of the Church, Chriſtians could never have imagined it ſo deteſtable a crime to kiſs the Croſs in remembrance of him who bore our Iniquities upon the wood, nor that ſo ſimple and natural a manifeſtation of thoſe ſentiments of tenderneſs, which that Pious Object excites in our hearts ought to make us regarded as if we Adored *Baal*, or the Golden Calves of *Samaria*.

During this ſtrange preoccupation of the Pretended Reform'd, this Treatiſe of the Expoſition might well appear to them (which really in effect it did) a Book full of Artifice, which did nothing but extenuate the Sentiments of Catholics. But now when they ſee clearly all the Artifice of this Book is to ſeparate the Doctrines which they have imputed to the Church, from thoſe which ſhe profeſſes, that all the mitigations he makes in Doctrine, is that he has taken off that hideous Maſque which the Miniſters had put upon it: Let them confeſs this Church was not worthy of ſo much horror, as they had for her, and that at leaſt ſhe deſerves to be heard.

Neither the Pope, nor the See Apoſtolic ought to be hereafter accuſed of diminiſhing that adoration which is due to God, nor that confidence which a Chriſtian ought to eſtabliſh in his ſole goodneſs through our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſince they ſee, without farther ſearch, this Treatiſe of the Expoſition, which is made only to explicate theſe two Truths, has received at *Rome* and from the Pope himſelf ſo Authentic an Approbation.

After this they will certainly be aſhamed of that Title which they give the Pope. No one can think on it without horror, nor hear without aſtoniſhment, that the Pretended Reform'd, who boaſt to follow Scripture word for word, when the Apoſtle St. *John*, who has alone named Antichriſt, tells us three or four times that *Antichriſt is he who denies that Jeſus Chriſt is come in fleſh*, dare ſo much as think that he, who teaches ſo fully the Myſtery of *Jeſus Chriſt*, that is to ſay, his Divinity, his Incarnation, the ſuperabundance of his Merits, the neceſſity of his Grace, and that abſolute confidence we muſt have in it, ſhould nevertheleſs be that Antichriſt diſcribed by the Apoſtle. 1 Joh 2. 22. 4. 3. 2 Joh. 1. 7.

But it is objected againſt the Popes, that they *are that wicked Perſon that man of Iniquity who has ſeated himſelf in the Temple of God; and makes* 2 Theſ. 2. 34.

himſelf

himself adored as God; They who confess themselves not only mortal men, but sinners, who pray every day with the rest of the Faithful, *Forgive us our offences*, and who never approach the Altar without Confessing of their sins, and without saying in the most essential part of the Holy Sacrifice, they hope for eternal life, *not by their own Merits, but through the Bounty of God in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ.*

'Tis true, they maintain that Primacy which *Jesus Christ* has given them in the Person of St. *Peter*; but it is by That they advance the Work of *Jesus Christ* himself, the Work of Charity and Concord, which would never have been perfectly accomplished, if the Universal Church and all the *Episcopal* Order had not one Head of Ecclesiastical Government upon Earth, to make the Members act in concurrence, and accomplish in the whole Body the Mystery of Unity so much recommended by the Son of God. It is just as much as nothing to answer, that the Church has her true Head in Heaven, who Unites her by animating her with his Holy Spirit: Who doubts of it! But who do's not know this Holy Spirit, who disposes all things with as much sweetness as efficacy, knows also how to prepare exterior means proportionable to his designs? The Holy Ghost both teaches and governs us interiorly: Therefore he establishes Pastors and teachers to Act exteriorly. The Holy Ghost Unites the Body of the Church and the Ecclesiastical Government: Therefore it is he places at the head a common Father, and a Principal Dispenser, who may Govern the whole Family of *Jesus Christ*. We call here to witness the Consciences of those of the Pretended Reform'd Religion. In this unfortunate age, when so many wicked Sects endeavour by little and little to undermine the Foundations of Christianity, and believe it enough only to name *Jesus Christ* to introduce indifferency in Religion, and manifest impiety into the Bosom of the Church, Who sees not the necessity of a Pastor, who may watch over his flock, and, authorized from above, encite all others whose vigilance might slacken? Let them in reality tell us, if it be not the *Socinians*, the *Anabaptists*, the *Independents*, those who under the name of Christian Liberty would establish indifferency in Religions, and so many other pernicious Sects, which they condemn as well as we, who fly with the greatest impetuosity against St. *Peters* Chair, and cry loudest that his Authority is Tyrannical? I do not wonder at it: Those who would divide the Church, or surprise her, fear nothing more than to see her March against them like a well ranged Army under one Head. Let us not raise a quarrel with any, let us only reflect whence come those Books, wherein these dangerous Licenses, and Antichristian Doctrines are taught: At least none can deny but the See of *Rome*, by the very Constitution of it, is incompatible with these Novelties; and if we could not know by the Gospel that the Primacy of this See is necessary for us, Experience it self would convince us of it. Moreover, we must

not

not be aſtoniſhed if this Author of the Expoſition, who places the eſſential Authority of this See in thoſe things wherein all Catholic Schools agree, hath been approved without difficulty. The Chair of St. *Peter* ſtands in need of no diſputing; what all Catholics acknowledge without conteſtation, ſuffices to maintain that Power which was given to it for edification, and not for deſtruction. The Pretended Reform'd ſhould hereafter give way no more to thoſe vain Phantoms with which they are frighted. What do's it profit them to ſearch in Hiſtories for the Vices of Popes? When, if what they meet with there ſhould be true, do's the Vices of Men deſtroy the Inſtitution of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and the Privikedge of St. *Peter*? Shall the Church riſe in Rebellion againſt a Power which maintains her Unity, under pretence that ſome have abus'd it? Chriſtians are accuſtomed to reaſon upon higher and more true Principles, and know that God is able to maintain his Works in the midſt of all the Evils which accompany humane Frailty.

We do then conjure thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, by that Charity, which is God himſelf, by the Name of Chriſtian, which is common to us both, not to Judge of the Doctrine of our Church, by what they hear in their Sermons or Read in their Books, where many times the heat of diſpute, and Prevention (not to mention any other) make things to be frequently otherwiſe repreſented then they are; but to hearken to this Expoſition of the Catholic Doctrine. It is a work in reality, which conſiſts not ſo much in diſputing, as in explicating clearly our Belief; In which to ſee how plainly the Author has proceeded, we need only conſider his deſign.

He promiſed in the very beginning,

1. To propoſe the true Tenets of the Catholic Church, and *to diſtinguiſh them from thoſe which are falſely imputed to her.* Exp. p. 1.

2. To the end no one ſhould doubt but that he faithfully propoſed the true Sentiments of the Church, he promiſed to take them *from the Council* of *Trent*, where the Church has ſpoken deciſively upon the things in queſtion. Exp. p. 2.

3. He promiſed to propoſe to the Pretended Reform'd not all points in general, but *thoſe which cauſed the greateſt ſeperation betwixt them and us*, and to ſpeak properly, thoſe which they made the occaſion of their breach. Exp. p. 2.

4. He promiſed that what he *ſaid, to make the Deciſions of the Council more intelligible, ſhould be approved of in the Church, and manifeſtly conformable to the Doctrine of the ſame Council.* Exp. p. 2.

All this is plain and juſt. And, in the firſt place, no body can think it ſtrange, we ſhould diſtinguiſh the Churches Tenets *from thoſe which are falſely imputed to her.* When Perſons are animated beyond meaſure, for want of a right underſtanding, and when ſtrange prejudices move great diſputes, there is nothing more natural, nothing more charitable, then

then to explicate matters clearly. The Holy Fathers practiſed a way fraudleſs and calm like this, to ſet men right again. Whilſt the *Arians* and *Semi-Arians* decryed the Symbol of *Nice*, and the Conſubſtantiality of the Son, by the falſe Idea's they fixed upon them, *St. Athanaſius* and *St. Hilarius*, the two moſt illuſtrious defenders of the *Nicene* Faith, repreſented to them the true Senſe of the Councils: And *St. Hilarius* ſaid to them: *Let us both together condemn falſe Interpretations, but not deſtroy the certainty of Faith.* The Word *Conſubſtantial may be miſunderſtood: Let us reſolve how we may rightly underſtand it. We may lay down the true ſtate of Faith betwixt us, if we do not overthrow what has been rightly eſtabliſhed, but remove miſ-underſtandings.*

S. Hil. lib. de ſyn.

It is Charity it ſelf which dictates ſuch words, and ſuggeſts ſuch means to reunite our minds. We may ſay the ſame to theſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion: If the Merit of Good Works, if Prayers addreſſed to Saints, if the Euchariſt, if the humble ſatisfactions of Penitents, who endeavour to appeaſe the wrath of God in voluntarily revenging upon themſelves by Laborious Exerciſes his offended Juſtice, if the Terms we uſe of a Tradition which claims its Origin from the firſt Ages, for want of being rightly underſtood offend you; The Author of the Expoſition offers himſelf to give you the plain and natural explication of them, which the *Church* has always faithfully conſerv'd. He ſays nothing of his own, he alledges not particular Authors; and to the end he may not be ſuſpected of changing the Tenets of the Church, he uſes the proper Terms of the Council of *Trent*, where ſhe has explicated her ſelf upon theſe matters in queſtion: what can there be more rational?

This was the Second thing he promiſed, and he has in this only followed the Example of the Pretended Reform'd. They complain as well as we, their Doctrines are not rightly underſtood; and the means they propoſe to come to a true knowledg of them, is not different from that which *M. de Condom* makes uſe of. Their Synod of *Dort* requires that *none judge of the Faith of their Churches from Calumnies picked up here and there, or paſſages of particular Authors, which are often falſely cited, or wreſted to a ſenſe contrary to their Intentions; but from the Confeſſions of Faith of their Churches, and from the the Declaration of their Orthodox Doctrine unanimouſly made in this Synod.*

Concluſio Synodi Dordrac in Syntag. Confeſſ. Fidei edit. Genev. p. 2.

The Faith then of a Church muſt be learnt from its publick Definitions, and not from Private Authors, who may be falſely quoted, miſ-underſtood, and may alſo themſelves miſ-explicate the Sentiments of their Religion. Upon which account it will be only neceſſary, that, to expound ours to the Pretended Reform'd, we produce the Deciſions of the Council of *Trent*.

I know the very name of this Council offends thoſe of the Reformation, and the *Anonymus* often ſhews his ill humour againſt it. But what do his Invectives avail him? We go not here about to juſtifie the Council. It ſuffices for this Author of the Expoſition, that the Doctrine of this Council

Council is Univerſally received, without Conteſtation, through the whole Catholic Church, and that ſhe admits of no other Deciſions, in theſe matters of Controverſie, but of this Council.

The Pretended Reform'd have always endeavoured to have theſe Deciſions thought ambiguous, and the *Anonymus* reproaches us alſo with their being capable of a *double or triple Senſe*. Thoſe who have not read this Council, unleſs it were in the Invectives of their Miniſters, and in the Hiſtory of *Fra. Paul*, the declared Enemy of it, believe them ſuch: But one word will Satisfie them. It is very true there was ſome Points the Council would not decide, and they were thoſe concerning which there was no ſettled Tradition, and which were diſputed of in the Schools; It was but Reaſonable they ſhould be left undecided: But for thoſe it has decided, it has ſpoken ſo preciſely, that amongſt ſo many Decrees of this Council produced in the Expoſition, the *Anonymus* could not find ſo much as one, in which there was this double or triple Senſe he objects againſt us. An. p. 11. 12.

In effect, It is but reading them, and one ſhall ſee how they have not any ambiguity, and that it is impoſſible for men to explicate themſelves more clearly.

We may put the Expoſition it ſelf to the ſame Teſt, and judge by that, whether the *Anonymus* had reaſon to upbraid the Author of this Expoſition with *thoſe rambling and general Terms in which* (ſays he) *he entanglingly wraps up the moſt difficult matters.* Avert. p. 24. Rep. p 12.

The third thing the Author of the Expoſition promiſed, was to treat of thoſe matters *which gave occaſion to the Seperation.* This is preciſely what ought to be done. There is no one who knows not that in diſputes there are always ſome certain principal points upon which mens minds are fixed. It is to theſe a perſon muſt apply himſelf who would make it his buſineſs to end or appeaſe thoſe Conteſts. Thus did the Author of the Expoſition, who in the very beginning declared to the Pretended Reform'd, that he would expound to them thoſe Points *from which they took the Subject of their Separation.* And to ſhew it was a deliberate Expreſſion, he again declares the ſame at the latter end, *that to keep himſelf fixed to what is principal, he omitted ſome queſtions which they of the Pretended Reform'd Religion did not look upon as a lawful Subject of ſeparation.* Exp. p. 2. Expoſ. p. 43.

He has kept his word moſt faithfully, and the Titles alone of the Expoſition will make it appear, how he has not omitted any one of thoſe Principal Articles.

So that the *Anonymus* ſhould not have accuſed *M. de Condom of having ſome ſelect Terms to avoid the difficulties which give him the moſt trouble; of leaving many queſtions untouched, and making haſte to that of the Euchariſt, where he thought he could enlarge himſelf with leſs diſadvantage.* Avert. p. 22. Repl. p. 168.

What an Idea would he give us of this Book of the Expoſition! But it deſtroys it ſelf. Every one ſees it was *M. de Condom's* buſineſs to enlarge himſelf upon that point of the Euchariſt, not becauſe he thought he

could do it *with leſs diſadvantage*, but becauſe this point is in reality the moſt difficult, and full of great queſtions. So that it will appear he has treated theſe matters with leſs or greater ſcope, according as they appear'd leſs or more embroiling, not to him, but to thoſe, for whom he writes. And if it be true that *he lays aſide thoſe difficulties which give him the moſt trouble*, it muſt be allow'd, thoſe which give him the leaſt, are in reality thoſe which are the moſt eſſential, and thoſe in which the Pretended Reform'd always thought themſelves the moſt ſecure. He has treated of the worſhip due to God, of Prayers to Saints, of the Honor we render to them, as alſo to their Images and Reliques. He has ſpoken of juſtifying Grace, of the Merit of Good Works, of the neceſſity of Works of Satisfaction, of Purgatory, of Indulgences, of Sacramental Confeſſion and Abſolution, of the Real Preſence of the Body and Blood of our Saviour in the Euchariſt, of that Adoration which is therein due to him, of Tranſubſtantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Altar, of Communion under one Species, of the Authority of Tradition and that of the Church, of the Divine Inſtitution of the Popes Primacy, where he has in one word explained what is to be believed of Epiſcopacy. He has expounded all theſe difficulties, and there needs only a little honeſty to grant he has been ſo far from avoiding difficulties, as the *Anonymus* would have it thought, that he has principally applyed himſelf to thoſe which the Pretended Reform'd find the greateſt. The *Anonymus* tells us himſelf *the Invocation of Saints is one of the moſt eſſential Articles of Religion*; and at the ſame time he adds, *this is one of thoſe upon which* M. de Condom *has been moſt prolix*. What points are more exactly treated in the Expoſition than thoſe of the Euchariſt and the Sacrifice, that of Images, of Merit, of Good works, of Satisfaction? and is it not in theſe the Pretended Reform'd find the greateſt difficulties? In fine, we will ask even themſelves, whether it be not true, that if they were ſatisfied in all thoſe points treated of in the Expoſition, they would not any longer heſitate to embrace the Faith of the Church? It is therefore certain, the Author has treated all thoſe Capital points upon which both of us agree the greateſt difficulties move. Nay more, he has always ſounded the difficulty to the very bottom applying himſelf chiefly, according to his firſt promiſe, to thoſe parts where the Catholic Doctrine is accuſed to ſtrike at the Foundations of Faith and Chriſtian Piety. It is not therefore to avoid difficulties, he has left ſome queſtions untouched which are but Conſequences and fuller Explications of thoſe which he has handled; or at leaſt, are ſuch as diſturb no body: But, on the contrary, he has done it that he might apply himſelf with leſs diſtraction to the chief difficulties upon which depend the Deciſion of our Controverſies.

p. 61.

The Author of the Expoſition has been no leſs Faithful in performance of his fourth promiſe, which was to affirm nothing, to make the Council better underſtood, *which was not manifeſtly conformable to it, and approved of in the Church.*

Evp. p. 2.

The

The *Anonymus* looks upon theſe words, and all the deſign of the Expoſition, as a *Teſtimony* which ſhows *the Doctrine of the Roman Church (tho' explained ſo clearly, and decided in the Council of* Trent) *to be not yet ſo clear, but that it needs an explication.* An rep. p. 11

M. Noguier ſeems alſo to draw the ſame Conſequence, and they have both of them looked upon the Expoſition as an Explication which the obſcurity of the Council ſtood in need of. Nog. p. 39, 40.

But we know how the obſcurity of a Deciſion, eſpecially in matters of Faith, is not always that which makes it be taken in a wrong ſence: it is a preoccupation of mind, the ardour of diſpute, the heat of Perſons engaged, which make them not underſtand one another, and often attribute to an adverſary what he believes the leaſt. So that when the Author of the Expoſition propoſes the Deciſions of the Council of *Trent* to the Pretended Reform'd, and adds what may be uſeful to remove thoſe Impreſſions which hinder them from underſtanding them aright, they ought not to conclude from thence that the Deciſions are Ambiguous, but only that nothing is ſo well digeſted, nor ſo clear but may be underſtood amiſs, when prejudice and paſſion interpoſe.

To what purpoſe then do *M. Noguier* and the *Anonymus* object to the Author of the Expoſition the Bull of Pope *Pius* IV. The deſign of the Expoſition has nothing of thoſe Gloſſes and Commentaries which with great reaſon this Pope Condemned. For what did thoſe Commentators and Gloſſars, eſpecially thoſe who have writ Gloſſes upon the Laws? what did they for the moſt part but fill the margents with their own imaginations, which moſt commonly ſerve only to confound the Text, and which notwithſtanding they give for the Text it ſelf? Let us add, that, for the conſervation of Unity, this Pope was obliged not to permit every Doctor to propoſe Deciſions upon doubts which ſucceeding time and vain ſubtilties might give birth to. Nor has any thing of this nature been done in the Expoſition. It is one thing to interpret what is obſcure and doubtful, another to propoſe what is clear, and to make uſe of it to remove falſe impreſſions. The laſt is what the Author of the Expoſition, has endeavour'd preciſely. And if he has added ſome of his own Reflections to the Deciſions of this Council, to make them more intelligible to thoſe People who would never look upon them without prejudice, it is becauſe their preoccupation had need of ſuch an aſſiſtance. An. p. 10. Nog. p. 40.

But why ſhould we ſpeak any more of a thing which is clear enough? We have in few words given a certain method to enlighten the underſtandings of thoſe who are the moſt zealous to maintain this ambiguity of the Council. They need only read in this Expoſition its Decrees which are there produced, and convince themſelves by their own eyes.

The moſt important thing here, is, that the Author of the Expoſition was not deceiv'd when he promiſed what he ſhould ſay, for the better underſtanding of this Council, ſhould be manifeſtly of the ſame Spirit, and

and approved of in the Church. The matter is in it ſelf clear, and the following Approbations will make it apparent.

It muſt not therefore be ſuppos'd henceforwards that the Sentiments explained in this Work, are the *qualifying or the extenuating thoughts* of one man; but the Common Doctrine which we ſee is, for this reaſon, univerſally approved. It will not therefore avail *M. Noguiers* nor the *Anonymus* any thing after this, either to object to us thoſe Practices which they call general, or the particular opinion of Doctors. For without examining theſe unneceſſary things, it ſuffices in one word to ſay, that thoſe Practices and Opinions, be they what they will, which are not found to be conformable to the intent and Deciſions of the Council, are nothing to Religion, nor to the body of the Catholic Church, nor ought by conſequence, as the Pretended Reform'd do themſelves avouch, to give the leaſt pretence to ſeparate from us, becauſe no one is obliged either to approve or follow them.

An. p. 2. *&c.* Nog. p. 38, *&c.* Exp. p. 2. Daille Apol. c. 6. Nog. p. 8.

But, ſay they, thoſe abuſes ought to be ſuppreſſed: as if one of the ways to ſuppreſs them were not to ſhew the truth in its purity without prejudice to the other means, with which Prudence and Zeal may inſpire the Biſhops. As for the remedy of Schiſm practiſed by the pretended Reformers, if it were not deteſtable in it ſelf, the miſeries which it has cauſed, and do's at preſent cauſe throughout Chriſtendom, would give us a horrour of it.

I will not here reproach the pretended Reform'd with the abuſes which are amongſt them. This work of Charity do's not permit ſuch like Recriminations. It ſuffices I advertiſe them that to attaque us in reality, they muſt cumbat, not thoſe abuſes which we Condemn as well as they, but the Doctrines which we maintain. But if, in examining them more narrowly, they find, they give not ſcope enough to their Invectives, they ought at laſt to acknowledge, we have reaſon to tell them the Faith which we profeſs is leſs worthy of blame than they believ'd it was.

It remains at preſent, that we beg of God to grant they may read a Work without bitterneſs, which is publiſhed only to inſtruct them. The Succeſs is in his Hands who alone can touch the Heart. He knows the Limits he has fixt to the Progreſs of Errour, and the Miſeries of his afflicted Church, by the loſs of ſo great a number of her Children. But we cannot hinder our ſelves from hoping ſome great effects towards the reunion of Chriſtians, under a Pope, who exerciſes ſo piouſly, and with ſo perfect a Zeal, free from Intereſt, the moſt holy Function in the World; and under a King, who prefers before all the Conqueſts that have enlarged his Kingdom, thoſe that might gain him his own Subjects to the Church.

AN

AN EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH IN MATTERS of CONTROVERSIE.

SECT. I.

Catholick Doctrine

The Design of this Treatise.

AFter a Conteſtation, for above an Age, with thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion; Matters from whence they took the ground of their Separation ought to be ſufficiently cleared, and their minds diſpoſed to a right conception of the Sentiments of the Catholic Church. So that to me nothing ſeems more proper, then to propoſe her Tenets plainly, and ſimply, and to diſtinguiſh them right from thoſe which have been falſely imputed to her. In effect, I have, upon ſeveral occaſions, taken notice, that the Averſion which theſe Gentlemen have to moſt of our Sentiments, is grounded upon ſome falſe *Idea's*, which they have formed to themſelves, concerning them; or elſe upon ſome certain words, which are ſo offenſive to them, that they immediately ſtop there, and never come ſo far as to conſider the grounds of things. Upon which account, I thought nothing could be more be-

neficial, then to explicate to them what the Church has defined in the Council of *Trent* concerning those points, which keep them at fartheſt diſtant from us; without medling with that which they are accuſtomed to object either againſt particular Doctors, or againſt thoſe Tenets which are neither neceſſarily, nor univerſally received. For all Parties agree, and *M. Daille* himſelf is of this Opinion, that *it is a very unreaſonable thing to attribute the Sentiments of particular Perſons to a whole body*; and he adds, that no ſeparation ought to be but upon the account of Articles authenticly eſtabliſhed, to the belief and obſervance of which all Perſons are obliged. I will not meddle then with any thing but the Decrees of the Council of *Trent*; becauſe in them the Church has given her Deciſion upon theſe matters now in agitation: And what I ſhall ſay for the better underſtanding of thoſe Deciſions, ſhall be what is approved of in the Church, and ſhall manifeſtly appear conformable to the Doctrine of this Council.

Apol. c. 6.

This Expoſition of our Doctrine will produce two good effects. The *firſt*, that many diſputes will wholly vaniſh, becauſe it will appear they are only grounded upon ſome erroneous explications of our belief. The *Second*, that thoſe diſputes, which remain, will not appear, according to the Principles of the pretended Reform'd, ſo Capital, as at firſt they endeavoured to Repreſent them; and that, according to the ſame Principles, they contain nothing any ways injurious to the grounds of Faith.

SECT. II.

Thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion acknowledg, That the Catholic Church embraces all the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Religion.

AND to begin with the Fundamental and Principal Articles of Faith; theſe Gentlemen of the Pretended Reform'd Religion muſt of neceſſity acknowledg they are believed and profeſſed in the Catholic Church.

If they will have them to conſiſt in believing we muſt adore one only God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and that we muſt put our truſt in God alone, through his Son, who became man, was Crucified, and roſe again for us; they know in their Conſciences we profeſs this Doctrine: And if they add thoſe other Articles which are comprehended in the Apoſtles Creed; they do not doubt alſo but we receive them all without exception, and have a pure and true knowledge of them.

M. Daille has writ a Treatiſe, intituled *Faith founded upon the Scriptures*, in which after having expoſed all the Articles of Faith held by the Pretended

Pretended Reform'd Churches, he tells us, *they are beyond all conteſtation; that the* Roman *Church profeſſes to believe them; that in reality they do not hold all our Opinions, but that we hold all their Articles of Faith.* Part 3, c. 1.

This Miniſter then cannot, unleſs he deſtroy his own Faith, deny but that we believe all the Principal Articles of the Chriſtian Religion.

But tho' *M. Daille* had not granted thus much, the thing is manifeſt in it ſelf, and all the world knows, that we believe all thoſe Articles which *Proteſtants* call Fundamental; ſo that ſincerity it ſelf demands they ſhould without diſpute grant, us not to have really rejected any of them.

The Pretended Reform'd, who ſee the advantages we may draw from this acknowledgment, are deſirous to deprive us of them, by ſaying that we deſtroy thoſe Articles, by interpoſing others contrary to them. This is what they endeavour to perſwade by Conſequences drawn from our Doctrine; but the ſame *M. Daille* (whoſe authority I alledge once more, not ſo much to convince them by the Teſtimony of one of their moſt Learned Miniſters, as becauſe what he ſays is in it ſelf evident) tells them what they ought to think of ſuch kind of Conſequences, ſuppoſing ill ones might be drawn from our Doctrine. See what he writes in his Letter to *M. Monglat*, upon account of his Apology. *Altho' the Opinion of the Lutherans as well as that of Rome do's, according to us, infer the deſtruction of the Humanity of* JESUS CHRIST, *yet this Conſequence cannot be attributed to them without Calumny, ſeeing they do formally reject it.*

There is nothing more eſſential to the Chriſtian Religion, then the reality of the Human Nature in JESUS CHRIST: And yet tho' the *Lutherans* hold a Doctrine, from whence is inferr'd the deſtruction of this Capital verity, by Conſequences, which the Pretended Reform'd judge evident; yet they have not ſcrupled to offer to Communicate with them; becauſe their Opinion *has no Poyſon in it*, as *M. Daille* tells us in his Apology; And their National *Synode*, held at *Carenton* 1631, admits them *to the Holy Table*, upon this ground, *that they agree in the principal and Fundamental points of Religion.* It is then a certain Maxim eſtabliſhed amongſt them, that they muſt not in theſe Caſes look upon the Conſequences, which may be drawn from a Doctrine, but purely upon what he propoſes and acknowledges, who teaches it. Chap. 7.

So that when they infer by Conſequences, which they pretend to draw from our Doctrine, that we do not ſufficiently acknowledge that Soveraign Glory which is due to God, nor the quality of Saviour and Mediator in JESUS CHRIST, nor the infinite value of his Sacrifice, nor the ſuperabundant Plenitude of his Merits: We may defend our ſelves without difficulty from ſuch Conſequences, by this ſhort anſwer of *M. Daille*, and tell them that the Catholic Church diſavowing them, they cannot be imputed to her *without Calumny.*

But I will go yet further, and ſhow theſe Gentlemen of the Pre-

tended Reform'd Religion, by the ſole Expoſition of our Doctrine, that the Catholic Church is ſo far from ruining the Fundamental Articles of Faith, either directly or indirectly; that on the contrary ſhe eſtabliſhes them after ſo ſolid and evident a manner, that no one can queſtion her right underſtanding of them without great injuſtice.

SECT. III.

Religious Worſhip is Terminated in God alone.

TO begin with that Adoration which is due to God alone; the Catholick Church teaches us, that it conſiſts principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the Powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope and Charity, as to him alone who can render us happy by the Communication of an infinite Good, which is himſelf.

This interior Adoration, which we render to God in Spirit and in Truth, has its exterior marks; of which the principal is Sacrifice, which cannot be offered to any but to God; becauſe a Sacrifice is eſtabliſhed to make a publick acknowledgment, and a ſolemn proteſtation of Gods Soveraignity, and our abſolute dependance.

The ſame Church teaches us, that all *Religious worſhip* ought to terminate in God as its neceſſary end; and that if the Honor which She renders to the Bleſſed Virgin, and to the Saints may, in ſome ſence, be called *Religious*, it is for its neceſſary Relation to God.

But before we explicate any farther in what this Honor conſiſts, it will not be unuſeful to take notice, how thoſe of the Pretended Reformation (obliged by the ſtrength of truth) begin to acknowledge the cuſtom of praying to Saints, and Honoring their *Reliques* was eſtabliſhed even in the fourth Age of the Church. *Monſieur Daille* grants thus much, in that Book he publiſhed againſt the Tradition of the *Latin Church* about the object of Religious Worſhip, and accuſes St. *Baſil*, St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Hierome*, St. *John Chryſoſtome*, St. *Auguſtin*, and many more of thoſe famous Lights of Antiquity who lived in that Age, and above all St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, who is called the *Divine* by excellence, of having altered, in this point, the Doctrine of the three foregoing Ages. But it will not appear very likely, that *M. Daille* ſhould underſtand the Sentiments of the Fathers of the firſt three Ages, better then thoſe who gathered, as I may ſay, the ſucceſſion of their Doctrine after their deaths; and this will be ſo much the leſs credible, becauſe the Fathers of the fourth Age were ſo far from perceiving they introduced any Novelty in that Worſhip, that this Miniſter, on the contrary, has quoted ſeveral expreſs Texts, by which he ſhows clearly, they pretended in Praying to Saints, to follow the example of their Predeceſſors. But with

without any farther examination what might be the Sentiments of the Fathers of the three first Ages, I will content my self with what *M. Daille* is pleased to grant, allowing us so many great men who taught the Church in the fourth Age. For tho' he has taken upon him twelve hundred Years after their deaths, to give them in derision the name of a kind of Sect, calling them *Reliquarists*, that is to say, Relique-honorers; yet I hope those of his Communion will have more respect for these great Men. They dare not at least accuse them of falling into Idolatry, by praying to Saints, or of destroying that trust which Christians ought to put in *JESUS CHRIST*: and it is to be hoped henceforwards they will not reproach these things to us when they consider they cannot do it without accusing at the same time these excellent Men, whose Sanctity and Learning they profess a reverence for, as well as we. But seeing our design is here to expound our Belief, rather then to show who were the defenders of it, we must continue our Explication.

SECT. IV.

Invocation of Saints.

THE Church in teaching, it is profitable to pray to Saints, teaches us to pray to them in the same Spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of Fraternal Society, which moves us to demand assistance of our brethren living upon Earth; and the Catechism of the Council of *Trent* concludes, from this Doctrine, that if the quality of Mediator, which the Scripture gives to *JESUS CHRIST*, received any prejudice from the Intercession made to the Saints, who Reign with God, it would receive no less from the Intercession made to the faithful who live with us. *Cat. Rom. part 3. tit.* De Cultu & Invoc. Sanct.

This Catechism shows us clearly the extream difference betwixt our manner of imploring God's assistance, and that of imploring the aid of Saints: *For* (saith it) *we pray to God, either to give us good things, or to deliver us from evil; but because the Saints are more acceptable to him then we are, we beg of them to undertake our Cause, and to obtain for us those things we stand in need of. From whence it comes to pass, that we use two very different forms of Prayer; for to God the proper manner of speaking is to say, HAVE PITY ON US, HEAR OUR PRAYER; whereas we only desire the Saints TO PRAY FOR US.* From whence we ought to understand, that in what Terms soever those prayers, which we address to Saints, are couched, the intention of the Church, and of her faithful, reduces them always to this form, as the Catechism presently after confirms. *Part 4. tit.* quis orandus sit? *Ibid.*

But

Seſſ. 25. Dec. de Invoc. &c. But it is good to conſider the words of the Council it ſelf, which preſcribing to Biſhops how they ought to ſpeak of the Invocation of Saints, obliges them to teach, *that the Saints who reign with* JESUS CHRIST, *offer up to God their Prayers for Men; that it is good and profitable to invocate them after an humble manner, and to have recourſe to their Prayers, Aid, and Aſſiſtance, to obtain of God his Benefits through our Lord* JESUS CHRIST *his Son, who is our ſole Saviour and Redeemer.* After which the Council condemns thoſe who teach a contrary Doctrine. We ſee then, to Invocate the Saints, according to the ſenſe of this Council, is to have recourſe to their Prayers for obtaining Benefits from God through *JESUS CHRIST.* So that in reality we do not obtain thoſe Benefits, which we receive by the interceſſion of the Saints, otherwiſe then through *JESUS CHRIST* and in his Name; ſeeing theſe Saints themſelves pray in no other manner then through *JESUS CHRIST*, and are not heard but in his Name. This is the Faith of the Church, which the Council of *Trent* has clearly explicated in few words. After which we cannot imagine that any one ſhould accuſe us of forſaking *JESUS CHRIST*, when we beſeech his Members, who are alſo ours; his Children, who are our Brethren, and his Saints, who are our Firſt-fruits, to pray with us, and for us to our common Maſter, in the name of our common Mediator.

The ſame Council explicates clearly and in few words, what is the intention of the Church, when ſhe offers up to God the dreadful ſacrifice to Honor the memory of his Saints. This Honor which we render them in Sacrificing, conſiſts in naming them in the prayers we offer up to God, as his faithful ſervants; and in rendring him thanks for the Victories which they have gained, and in humbly beſeeching him that he would vouchſafe to favour us by their interceſſion. St. *Auguſtin* has told us twelve hundred Years ago, that we ought not to think any ſacrifices were offered to the Holy Martyrs, altho' the practice of the Univerſal Church in that time was to offer Sacrifice upon their holy bodies, and at their *Memories*; that is to ſay, before thoſe places where their precious Reliques were conſerv'd. This Father has moreover added, *that they made a Commemoration of the Martyrs at the Holy Altar, in the Celebration of the Sacrifice, not to pray for them as they do for other perſons who are dead; but rather, that they might pray for us.* I relate the ſentiments of this Holy Biſhop, becauſe the Council of *Trent* makes uſe of his very words almoſt to teach the Faithful, that *the Church does not offer Sacrifice to the Saints, but to God alone, who has crowned them; that the Prieſt alſo does not addreſs himſelf to* St. Peter *and* St. Paul, *ſaying,* I OFFER UP TO YOU THIS SACRIFICE; *but rendring thanks to God for their Victories, he demands their aſſiſtance, to the End thoſe whoſe Memory we celebrate upon Earth, would vouchſafe to pray for us in Heaven.* After this manner it is we Honor the Saints, that we may obtain the Graces of God

lib. 8. de Civ. c. 27.

Tract. 84. in Joh. Serm. 17. in verb. Apoſt.

Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 22. c. 3.

God by their Interceſſion; and the Principal of thoſe *Graces* we hope to obtain, is that of imitating them: To which we are excited by the conſideration of their admirable Examples, and by the Honor which we render in the Preſence of *God* to their happy Memories.

Thoſe who will rightly conſider the Doctrine we have propoſed, will be obliged to grant us, that as we do not rob *God* of any of thoſe perfections peculiar to his infinite Eſſence: So we do not attribute to Creatures any of thoſe qualities, or operations proper to God alone: Which diſtinguiſheth us ſo fully from Idolaters, that we cannot comprehend why ſuch a Title ſhould be given us.

And when theſe Gentlemen of the pretended Reformation object; that by Addreſſing our Prayers to the Saints, and Honoring them all the World over as preſent, we attribute to them a certain kind of Immenſity, or at leaſt the knowledg of the Secrets of Hearts which God has nevertheleſs reſerved to himſelf, as it appears by ſo many Teſtimonies of Scripture; they do not ſufficiently reflect upon our Doctrine. For, in fine, without examining what grounds may be had to attribute to the Saints ſome certain degree of knowledg as to thoſe things which are acted amongſt us, or alſo of our ſecret thoughts, it is manifeſt that to ſay a Creature may have the knowledg of theſe things, by a light communicated to him by God, is not to elevate a Creature above his Condition. The Example of the Prophets juſtify this clearly, God having not diſdained to diſcover future things to them, tho' they appear much more particularly reſerved to his own knowledge.

Moreover, never any Catholic yet thought the Saints knew our neceſſities by their own Power, no nor the deſires which move us to Addreſs our ſecret Prayers to them. The Church contents her ſelf to teach, with all Antiquity, theſe Prayers to be very profitable to ſuch who make them, whether it be the Saints know them by the miniſtry and communication of Angels, who, according to the Teſtimony of Scripture, know what paſſes amongſt us, being eſtabliſhed by Gods Order, as adminiſtring Spirits, to Co-operate with us in the work of our Salvation; whether it be that God himſelf makes known to them our deſires by a particular *Revelation*; or laſtly, whether it be that he diſcovers the ſecret to them in his *divine Eſſence* in which all truth is comprized. So that the Church has not decided any thing about theſe different methods, which God might be pleaſed to make uſe of for that end.

But let theſe means be what they will, it is always certain the Church do's not attribute to the Creature any of the divine perfections, as the Idolaters did; ſeeing She permits us not to acknowledge, even in the greateſt Saints, any degree of Excellency which do's not proceed from God; nor any acceptableneſs in his Sight, but by their vertues; nor any vertue, which is not a gift of his Grace; nor any knowledge of human

human affairs, but what is communicated to them; nor any Power to assist us, but by their Prayers; nor, in fine, any felicity, but by a submission and a perfect conformity to his Divine will.

It is therefore true, that by examining what are our interior sentiments concerning the Saints, it will be found we do not raise them above the condition of Creatures; and from thence one ought to judge of what nature that exterior Honor is, which we render them; exterior veneration being established to testifie the interior sentiments of the Mind.

But because this Honor, which the Church renders to the Saints, appears principally before their Images and holy Reliques, it will be proper to explicate her belief concerning them.

SECT. V.

Images and Reliques.

Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. Dec de Invoc &c.

AS for Images, the Council of *Trent* forbids us expressly *to believe any Divinity or vertue in them, for which they ought to be reverenced; To demand any favour of them, or to put any trust in them,* and ordains that all the honour which is given to them should be referred to the Saints themselves who are Represented by them.

All these words of the Council are like so many Characters to distinguish us from Idolaters, seeing we are so far from believing with them any Divinity annexed to the Images; that we do not attribute to them any other vertue but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they Represent.

Gal. 2.

The Honor we render Images is grounded upon this. No Man, for example, can deny but that when we look upon the figure of JESUS CHRIST Crucified, it excites in us a more lively remembrance of him, *who loved us so as to deliver himself up to Death for us.* While this Image being present before our Eyes, causes so pretious a remembrance in our Souls, we are moved to testifie by some exterior signs, how far our Gratitude bears us; and by humbling our selves before the Image, we show what is our submission to our Saviour. So that to speak precisely, and according to the Ecclesiastical stile, when we Honor the Image of an Apostle or a Martyr, our intention is not so much to *Honor the Image, as to Honor the Apostle or the Martyr in presence of the Image.* Thus the Roman Pontifical tells us, and the Council of *Trent* expresses the same thing, when it says, *that the Honor we render to Images, has such a reference to those they Represent; That by the means of those Images which we Kiss, and before which we Kneel, we adore* JESUS CHRIST, *and Honor the Saints, whose Types they are.*

Pont. Com. de Bened. Imag. Sess. 25. Dec. de Inv. &c.

In fine, one may know with what Intention the Church Honors Images,

Images, by that Honor which ſhe Renders to the Croſs and to the Bible. All the World ſees very well, that before the Croſs ſhe adores him who *bore our Iniquities upon the wood*; and that if her children bow the head before the Bible, if they riſe up out of reſpect when it is carried before them, and if they kiſs it Reverently, all this Honor is referred to the Eternal Verity which it propoſeth to us. 1 *Pet* 2.

They muſt have but little Juſtice who treat with the term of *Idolatry* that *Religious ſentiment* which moves us to uncover our heads, and bow them before the Image of the Croſs, in remembrance of him who was crucified for the Love of us; and it would be too much blindneſs not to perceive the exceſſive difference betwixt thoſe who put their truſt in Idols, out of an opinion that ſome Divinity, or ſome vertue was, as I may ſay, tied to them, and thoſe who declare, as we do, that they will not make uſe of Images, but to raiſe their minds towards Heaven, to the end they may there Honor *JESUS CHRIST* or his Saints, and in the Saints God himſelf, who is the Author of all Sanctity and Grace.

After the ſame manner we ought to underſtand that Honor which we pay to Reliques, following the Example of the Primitive Church; and if our Adverſaries would but Conſider that we look upon the Bodies of Saints, as having been Victims offered up to God either by Martyrdom or by Penance, they would not think the Honor which we pay them upon this account, could alienate us from that which we render to God himſelf.

We may ſay in general, That if they would but conſider how the affections which we bear to any one propagates it ſelf, without being divided, to his Children, to his friends, and after that, by ſeveral degrees, to the repreſentation of him, to any remains of him, and to any thing which renews in us his Remembrance; If they did but conceive that Honor has the like progreſſion, ſeeing Honor is nothing elſe but Love mixed with Reſpect and Fear; in fine, If they would but conſider, that all the exterior Worſhip of the Catholic Church has its ſource in God himſelf, and returns back again to him: They would never believe this Worſhip, which he himſelf alone animates, could excite his Jealouſie. They would, on the centrary, ſee, that if God, as jealous as he is of the love of Men, does not look upon us as dividing our ſelves betwixt him and Creatures, when we love our Neighbour for the love of him; The ſame God, tho jealous of the Honor which his Faithful pay him, cannot look upon them as dividing that Worſhip which is due to him alone, when out of reſpect to him, they Honor thoſe whom he has Honored.

Is it true, Nevertheleſs, that ſeeing the ſenſible marks of Reverence are not all of them abſolutely neceſſary, the Church might without the leaſt alteration in her Doctrine, extend theſe exterior Practices more or leſs, according to the different exigences of times, places, or occur-

rences, being desirous that her children should not be slavishly subject to sensible things, but only excited, and, as it were, advertised by their means to fly to God, and to offer up to him in Spirit and in Truth that Rational Service which he expects from his Creatures.

One may see by this Doctrine with what Truth I affirmed, that a great part of our Controversies would vanish by the sole understanding of the *Terms*, if these Points were but discussed with Charity. And if our Adversaries would but with Moderation consider the foregoing Explications, which comprehend the express Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, they would cease to accuse us of injuring the Mediation of *JESUS CHRIST*, of invocating the Saints, and adoring Images after a manner which is peculiar to God alone. It is true, that seeing, in one sense, Adoration, Invocation, and the Name of Mediator are only proper to God and *JESUS CHRIST*, it is no hard matter to misapply these Terms, whereby to render our Doctrine odious. But if they be strictly kept to that sense in which we use them, these Objections and Accusations will lose their force; and if any other less important Difficulties remain to these *Gentlemen* of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, Sincerity will oblige them to acknowledge they are satisfied as to the principal Subject of their Complaints.

Furthermore, there is nothing so unjust as to accuse the Church of placing all her Piety in these Devotions to the Saints, seeing, as we have already observed, the Council of *Trent* contents it self to teach the Faithful, That this Practice is *good and beneficial*, without saying any more of it. So that the Intention of the Church is only to condemn those who reject this Practice, either out of Disrespect or Error. She is obliged to condemn them, because she is obliged not to suffer any Practice which is beneficial to Salvation to be despised, nor a Doctrine authorised by *Antiquity* to be condemned by *Novellists*.

Sess. 29, Dec. de Invoc. &c.

SECT. VI.

Justification.

THe Doctrine of Justification will shew yet more clearly how many Difficulties may be ended by a plain Exposition of our Sentiments.

Those who are never so little versed in the History of the Pretended Reformation, are not ignorant how the first Authors propos'd this Article to all the World as the Principal of all the rest, and as the most essential Cause of their Separation: So that this is the most necessary to be well understood.

We believe, in the first place, That *our Sins are freely forgiven us by the Divine Mercy, for JESUS CHRIST's sake.* These are the express Terms

Conc. Trid. Sess. 6. c. 9.

Terms of the Council of *Trent.* which adds, that *we are said to be justified* gratis, *because none of those acts which Preceed Justification, whether they be Faith or Good Works, can merit this Grace.* *Ibid. c.* 8.

Seeing the Scripture explicates the *remission of Sins*, by sometimes telling us that *God covers them*, and sometimes that *he takes them away, and blots them out by the Grace of his Holy Spirit, which makes us new Creatures*; We believe, that to form a perfect Idea of the Justification of a Sinner, we must joyn together both these Expressions. For which Reason we believe our sins not only to be *covered*, but also *entirely washed away* by the Blood of *JESUS CHRIST*, and by the Grace of Regeneration; which is so far from obscuring or lessening that Idea which we ought to have of the Merit of this Blood, on the contrary it heightens and augments it. *Tit.* 3. 5, 6, 7.

So that the Justice of *JESUS CHRIST* is not only *imputed*, but *actually Communicated* to the Faithful, by the operation of the Holy Spirit; insomuch that they are not only reputed, but rendred just by his Grace.

If that Righteousness which is in us were only such in the Eyes of Men, it would not be the work of the Holy Ghost: It is then a Righteousness and that before God, seeing it is God himself who produces it in us, by pouring forth his Charity in our Hearts.

Nevertheless it is too true, that *the flesh Rebels against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh*, and that *we all offend in many things.* So that, tho' our Justice be truly such, by the infusion of his Charity, yet it is not perfect Justice; because of the Combat of Concupiscence: Insomuch that the continual sighings of a Soul, penitent for her offences, is the most necessary Duty of a Christian righteousness, which obliges us to confess humbly with St. *Augustine*, that our justice in this life consists rather in the Remission of Sin, than in the perfection of Vertues. *Gal.* 5. 17. *Jam.* 3. 2.

SECT. VII.

Merits of Good Works

AS to the Merit of Good works, the Catholic Church teacheth us, that *eternal life ought to be proposed to the Children of God, both as a Grace, which is mercifully promised to them by the Mediation of our Lord* JESUS CHRIST, *and as a recompence which is faithfully rendred to their good Works, and Merits, in vertue of this Promise.* These are the proper Terms of the Council of *Trent.* But lest human Pride should flatter it self with an opinion of a presumptuous merit, the same Council teacheth us, that all the price and value of a Christians works proceeds from the sanctifying Grace which is given us *gratis* in the Name of *JESUS CHRIST*, and that it is an effect of the continual Influence of this Divine Head upon its Members. *Sess.* 6. *c.* 16. *Ibid.*

Really the Precepts, Exhortations, Promises, Threatnings, and

Reproaches of the *Gospel*, shew clearly enough, we must work out our Salvation by the Co-operation of our Wills together with the Grace of God assisting us: But it is one of our First Principles, That the Free-will can act nothing conducing to Eternal Happiness, but as it is moved and elevated by the Holy Ghost.

So that the Church knowing it is this Divine Spirit which works in us by his Graces all the Good we do, she is obliged to believe the Good Works of the Faithful are very acceptable to God, and of great consideration before him: And it is just she should make use of the word *Merit*, with all Christian Antiquity, whereby she may Principally denote the value, the price, and the dignity of those Works which we perform through Grace. But seeing all their Sanctity comes from God, who produces them in us, the same Church has in the Council of *Trent* received these words of St. *Augustin*, as a Doctrine of Catholic Faith, That *God Crowns his own Gifts in crowning the Merits of his Servants.*

We beg of those who love Truth and Peace, that they would be pleased here to read the words of this Council a little more at length, to the end they may once for all disabuse themselves of those false impressi-
Sess. 6. c. 16. ons which have been given them concerning our Doctrine. *Although we see*, say the Fathers in this Council, *that holy Writ esteems Good works so much, that* JESUS CHRIST *himself promises, a glass of cold water given to the poor shall not want its reward; and that the Apostle testifies how a moment of light pain endured in this world, shall produce an eternal weight of Glory: Nevertheless, God forbid a Christian should glory in himself, and not in our Lord, whose Bounty is so great to all men, that he will have those gifts which he bestows upon them to be their merits.*

Sess. 14. c. 8. This Doctrine is dispersed throughout the whole *Council*, which teacheth us in another Session, That *we, who can do nothing of our selves, can do all things with him who strengthens us, in such sort that man has nothing of which he may glory, nor for which he may confide in himself; but all his confidence, and all his glory is in* JESUS CHRIST, *in whom we live, in whom we merit, in whom we satisfie, bringing forth fruits worthy af repentance, which draw their vertue from him, and by him are offered to his Father, and accepted of by his Father through him.* Wherefore we ask all things, we hope all things, we render thanks for all things, through our Lord *JESUS CHRIST*. We confess aloud we are not acceptable to God but in and by him; and we cannot comprehend why any other thought should be attributed to us. We so place all the hopes of our Salvation in him, that we dayly make use of these words to God in the Sacrifice; *Vouchsafe, O God, to grant to us sinners, thy servants, who hope in the multitude of thy mercies, some part and society with the Blessed Apostles and Martyrs into whose number we beseech thee to be pleased to receive us, not looking upon our merits, but graciously pardoning us in the name of* JESUS CHRIST *our Lord.*

Will

Will the Church never be able to perſwade her Children, now become her Adverſaries, neither by the Expoſition of her Faith, nor by the Deciſions of her Councils, nor by the Prayers in her Sacrifice, that her Belief is, ſhe can have no Life but in *JESUS CHRIST*, and that ſhe has no Hope but in him? This Hope is ſo firm, it makes the Children of God, who walk faithfully in his ways, find *a peace which ſurpaſſeth all underſtanding*, as the Apoſtle tells us. But tho' this Hope be ſtronger than the Promiſes and Menaces of the World, and ſufficient to calm the Troubles of our Conſciences; yet it does not wholly extinguiſh Fear: For, tho' we be aſſured God will never abandon us of his own accord, yet we are never certain we ſhall not loſe him by our own fault, in rejecting his Inſpirations. He has been pleaſed by his ſaving Fear to mitigate that Confidence which he has infuſed into his Children, becauſe, as St. *Auguſtin* tells us, ſuch is our Infirmity in this place of Temptations and Dangers, that an abſolute Security would produce Tepidity and Pride in us; whereas this Fear, which, according to the Apoſtle's Command, *makes us work out our Salvation with trembling*, renders us more vigilant, and makes us relie with a more humble dependance upon him, *who works in us by his Grace, both to will, and to do, according to his good pleaſure*, as the ſame St. *Paul* expreſſes it. *Phil.* 4. 7. *Phil.* 2. 12. *Ibid.* 13.

Thus you have ſeen what is moſt neceſſary in the Doctrine of Juſtification; and our Adverſaries would be very unreaſonable, if they ſhould not confeſs, that this Doctrine ſuffices to teach Chriſtians they are obliged to refer all the Glory of their Salvation to God through *JESUS CHRIST*.

If the Miniſters after this ſhould go about to move Queſtions about Subtilties, it is good to adverti ſe them, That it becomes them not now to be ſo ſcrupulous in our behalfs, after having granted what they have done to the *Lutherans*, and their own Brethren, concerning Predeſtination and Grace. This their Conduct towards them, ought to have taught them in this matter to reduce themſelves to what is abſolutely neceſſary for the Eſtabliſhment of the Foundations of Chriſtian Piety.

But if they could but once reſolve to prefix theſe Limits to themſelves, they would be preſently ſatisfied, and they would ceaſe to accuſe us of annulling the Grace of God, by attributing all to our Good Works; ſeeing we have ſhown them in ſuch clear Terms of the Council of *Trent*, theſe three Points, ſo deciſive as to this Matter; *That our Sins are pardoned us out of pure Mercy, for the ſake of* JESUS CHRIST; *That we are indebted for that Juſtice which is in us by the Holy Ghoſt, to a Liberality* gratis *beſtowed upon us*; *and, That all the Good Works we do, are but ſo many Gifts of his Grace.*

And indeed we muſt acknowledge, that the Learned of their Party do not contend ſo much of late about this Subject, as they did formerly; and there are but few who do not now confeſs, there ought not to have been

been a Breach upon this Point. But if this important Difficulty about Juſtification, upon which their firſt Authors laid all their ſtreſs, be not looked upon now as Eſſential by the wiſeſt Perſons amongſt them, we leave them to think what they ought to judge of their Separation, and what hopes there would be of an Union, if they would but overcome their Prejudice, and quit the Spirit of Contention.

SECT. VIII.

Satisfactions, Purgatory, and Indulgences.

WE muſt farther explicate after what manner we believe we can make Satisfaction to God through his Grace, to the end we may not leave any doubt upon this Matter uncleared.

Catholics unanimouſly teach, That *JESUS CHRIST*, God and Man, was ſolely capable, through the infinite Dignity of his Perſon, to offer up to God a ſufficient Satisfaction for our Sins. But having ſatisfied ſuperabundantly, he could apply this infinite Satisfaction after two manners: either by an entire Remiſſion, without reſerving any Puniſhment; or elſe by changing a greater Puniſhment into a leſs, that is, an eternal Pain into a temporal. This firſt manner being more compleat, and more conformable to his Goodneſs, he makes uſe of it immediately in Baptiſm: but we believe he makes uſe of the ſecond in the Pardon he grants to thoſe who fall after Baptiſm, being carried in ſome manner to it by the Ingratitude of thoſe who have abuſed his firſt Gifts; ſo as they are to ſuffer ſome temporal Pain, tho' the eternal be remitted.

It muſt not be hence concluded, That *JESUS CHRIST* has not fully ſatisfied for us; but, on the contrary, That having obtained an abſolute Dominion over us, by the infinite Price he has given for our Salvation, he grants us Pardon, upon what Condition, what Law, or with what Reſtriction it pleaſes him.

We ſhould be injurious and ungrateful to our Saviour, ſhould we dare to deny the infinite Value of his Merits, under pretenſe that when he pardons us the Sin of *Adam*, he does not at the ſame time free us from all the Conſequences of it, but leaves us ſtill ſubject to Death, and ſo many other corporeal and ſpiritual Infirmities, which this Sin brought upon us. It ſuffices that *JESUS CHRIST* has once paid the Price by which we ſhall be one day entirely freed from the Evils which overwhelm us; it is our parts to embrace with humility and thankſgiving every part of his Benefits, by conſidering by what progreſs it pleaſes him to procure our Deliverance, according to that Order which his Wiſdom has eſtabliſhed for our good, and for a more clear manifeſtation of his Bounty and Juſtice.

Upon the like account we ought not to think it ſtrange, that he, who has

has ſhown us ſo great Mercy in Baptiſm, ſhould be more ſevere towards us, after our having violated our Holy promiſes. It is juſt, yes and beneficial to our Salvation, that God in remitting our Sin together with the Eternal pain which we deſerved for it, ſhould exact of us ſome Temporal Pain to retain us in our Duties; leſt if we ſhould be too ſpeedily freed from the Bonds of Juſtice, we ſhould abandon our ſelves to a temerarious Confidence, abuſing the facility of a Pardon.

It is then to ſatisfy this Obligation, we are ſubjected to ſome painful Works, which we muſt accompliſh in the Spirit of Humility and Penance; and it was the neceſſity of theſe ſatisfactory Works which obliged the Primitive Church to impoſe upon Penitents thoſe Pains called Canonical.

When therefore ſhe impoſes upon Sinners painful and laborious works and they undergo them with Humility, this is called *Satisfaction*; and when, regarding the fervour of the Penitents, or ſome other Good Works which ſhe has perſcribed them, ſhe pardons ſome part of that Pain which is due to them, this is call'd *Indulgence*.

The Council of *Trent* propoſes nothing elſe to be believed concerning *Indulgences*, but that *the power to grant them has been given to the Church, by* JESUS CHRIST, *and that the uſe of them is beneficial to Salvation*; to which this Council adds, *That this power ought to be retained, yet Nevertheleſs uſed with moderation, leſt Eccleſiaſtical diſcipline ſhould be weakned by an over-great facility.* Which ſhows the manner of granting Indulgences to regard diſcipline. *Contin. Seſſ. 25. Dec. de Indulg.*

Thoſe who depart this Life in Grace and Charity, but nevertheleſs indebted to the divine Juſtice ſome Pains which it reſerved, are to ſuffer them in the other Life. This is what obliged all the Primitive Chriſtians to offer up Prayers, Alms-deeds and Sacrifices, for the Faithful who departed in Peace and in the Communion of the Church, with an aſſured Faith that they could be aſſiſted by theſe means. This is what the Council of *Trent* propoſes to our Belief, touching the Souls detained in Purgatory, without determining in what their pains conſiſts, or many other ſuch like things; concerning which this holy Council demands great moderation, blaming thoſe who divulge what is uncertain or ſuſpected.

Such is the innocent and holy Doctrine of the Catholic Church touching Satisfactions, which has been imputed to her as ſo great a crime. If after this Explication, thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion accuſe us of injuring the *Satisfaction* of *JESUS CHRIST*, they muſt have forgotten what we told them, *that our B. Saviour paid the full Price of our Redemption*; *that nothing is wanting in this price, becauſe it is infinite*; *and how theſe remaining pains, of which we have ſpoken, come not from any defect in the Payment, but from a certain Order which he has eſtabliſhed to retain us in a ſaving diſcipline by juſt apprehenſions.*

But

But if they alſo tell us, *we believe we can of our ſelves ſatisfie for ſome part of the Pain due to our Sins*; we can with confidence aſſure them, the contrary appears by the Maxims we have eſtabliſhed; which Maxims make it clearly appear, that our Salvation is no other but a Work of Mercy and Grace; that what we do by the Grace of God, is no leſs his Work, than what he does alone by his abſolute Power; and, laſtly, that what we give to him, appertains no leſs to him, than what he gives to us. To which we muſt add, That what we call *Satisfaction*, following the Example of the Primitive Church, is, after all, nothing but the Application of the infinite *Satisfaction* of *JESUS CHRIST*.

This very Conſideration ought to appeaſe thoſe who are offended when we tell them, That God is ſo well pleaſed with Fraternal Charity, and the Communion of Saints, that he frequently alſo accepts of thoſe Satisfactions which we offer up one for another. It ſeems theſe Men do not conceive how much all we are belongs to God, nor how all the Kindneſſes which his Bounty makes him have for the Faithful, the Members of *JESUS CHRIST*, are neceſſarily referred to this Divine Head. But certainly thoſe who have read and conſidered how God himſelf inſpires his Servants with a deſire to afflict themſelves with Faſting, Hair-cloth, and Aſhes, not only for their own Sins, but alſo for the Sins of all the People, will not be aſtoniſhed if we ſay, That being touched with the delight he has to gratifie his Friends, he mercifully accepts of the humble Sacrifice of their voluntary Mortifications, in abatement of thoſe Chaſtiſements he prepared for his People: which ſhews, that being ſatisfied by theſe, he renders himſelf more mild towards the others, by this means honoring his Son *JESUS CHRIST* in the Communion of his Members, and in the holy Society of his myſtical Body.

SECT. IX.

The Sacraments.

THE Order of Doctrine requires we ſhould now ſpeak of the Sacraments, by which the Merits of *JESUS CHRIST* are applied to us. Seeing the Diſputes we have concerning them, if we except the Euchariſt, are not ſo hot as the others; we will, in the firſt place, clear, in ſhort, the chiefeſt Difficulties which are raiſed concerning the other, and reſerve the Euchariſt, as the moſt important of all the reſt, till the laſt.

The Sacraments of the New Covenant are not ſacred Signs only, which repreſent Grace, nor Seals which confirm it; but the Inſtruments of the Holy Ghoſt, which ſerve to apply it to us, and which confer it upon us by vertue of the Words which are pronounced, and the exterior Action which is performed, upon condition we put not any Impediment by our not being rightly diſpoſed. Whilſt

Whilſt God annexes ſo great Grace to exterior Signs, which have not of their own nature any proportion with ſo admirable an Effect, he ſhews us clearly, that beſides all we can do interiorly of our ſelves by our good Diſpoſitions, there muſt neceſſarily intervene, before we can be juſtified, a ſpecial Operation of the Holy Ghoſt, and a peculiar Application of the Merit of our Saviour, which is exhibited to us by the Sacraments. So that this Doctrine cannot be rejected without injuring the Merits of *JESUS CHRIST*, and the Operation of his Divine Power in our Regeneration.

We acknowledge ſeven ſacred Signs or Ceremonies eſtabliſhed by *JESUS CHRIST*, as the ordinary Means for the Sanctification and Perfection of the New Man. Their Divine Inſtitution appears in the Holy Scripture, either by the expreſs Words of *JESUS CHRIST*, who eſtabliſhed them, or by the Grace which, according to the ſame Scripture, is annexed to them, and neceſſarily ſhews a Divine Inſtitution.

Baptiſm.

Seeing little Children cannot ſupply the want of Baptiſm by Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, nor by the Vow to receive this Sacrament; we believe, that, if they do not really receive it, they do not in any manner partake of the Grace of Redemption; and therefore dying in *Adam*, they have not any part in *JESUS CHRIST*.

It is good to obſerve here how the *Lutherans* believe with the Catholic Church the abſolute neceſſity of Baptiſm, and are aſtoniſhed with Her, that ſuch a Truth ſhould be denied, which never any one before *Calvin* durſt openly call in queſtion, it was ſo firmly rooted in the Minds of all the Faithful.

Nevertheleſs, the Pretended Reform'd are not apprehenſive voluntarily to let their Children die like the Children of Infidels, without bearing any Mark of Chriſtianity, and without receiving any Grace, if their Deaths ſhould chance to prevent the Day of their Aſſembly.

Confirmation.

The Impoſition of Hands practiſed by the Holy Apoſtles, to confirm the Faithful againſt Perſecutions, having its principal Effect in the interior Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and the infuſion of his Gifts, it ought not to have been rejected by our Adverſaries, under pretenſe the Holy Ghoſt deſcends now no more viſibly upon us. Thus all Chriſtian Churches ſince the Apoſtles Times have Religiouſly retained it, making uſe alſo of holy Chriſm, to ſhew the Vertue of this Sacrament by a more expreſs Repreſentation of the interior Unction of the Holy Ghoſt. *Act.* 8. 15, 17.

Penance, and Sacramental Confeſſion.

We believe *JESUS CHRIST* has been pleaſed, that thoſe who have ſubmitted themſelves to the Authority of the Church by Baptiſm, and who have ſince violated the Laws of the Goſpel, ſhould come and ſubmit themſelves to the Judgment of the ſame Church in the Tribunal of Penance, where ſhe exerciſes the power which is given her of remitting and retaining ſins.

Matth. 18.18. *Joh.* 20. 23.

The terms of that Commiſſion which is given to the Miniſters of the Church to abſolve from ſin, are ſo general, they cannot without temerity be reſtrained to Public Sins; and ſeeing, when they pronounce that Abſolution in the Name of *JESUS CHRIST*, they only follow the expreſs Terms of this Commiſſion, the Sentence is look'd upon as rendred by *JESUS CHRIST* himſelf, by whom they are eſtabliſhed Judges. It is this inviſible High Prieſt who interiorly abſolves the Penitent, whilſt the Prieſt Exteriorly exerciſes the Function.

This Penitential Court of Judicature being ſo neceſſary a curb to Liberty, ſo plentiful a ſource of wiſe Admonitions, ſo ſenſible a Conſolation for Souls afflicted for their Sins, when their abſolution is not only declared in general Terms, as it is practiſed by the Miniſters, but when they are in reality abſolved by the Authority of *JESUS CHRIST*, after a particular examination, and knowledge of the Caſe: We cannot believe our Adverſaries can look upon ſo many benefits without regretting their loſs, and without being ſomewhat aſhamed of a Reformation which has caſt off ſo ſaving and ſo holy a Practiſe.

Extream Unction.

1 *Jac.* 14. 55.

The Holy Ghoſt having, according to the teſtimony of St. *James*, annexed an expreſs promiſe of remiſſion of Sins, and comfort of the ſick, to Extream Unction; nothing is wanting to make this Sacred Ceremony a true Sacrament. It is only to be remarked, that, according to the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, the ſick are more relieved in reſpect of the ſoul than of the body; and that, as the ſpiritual Profit is always the principal object of the new law, ſo it is that alſo which we ought abſolutely to expect from this holy Unction, if we be rightly diſpoſed for it; whereas the eaſe in ſickneſs is only granted with a reſpect to our eternal Salvation, according to the ſecret diſpoſitions of Divine Providence, and the different degrees of preparation and faith which are found in the Receiver.

Seſſ. 14. *c.* 2. de Sac. Extr. unc.

Marriage.

Matth. 19. 5. *Eph.* 5. 32.

When we conſider how *JESUS CHRIST* has given a new form to Marriage, reducing this holy Society to two perſons immutably and indiſſolubly united; and when we ſee this inſeparable Union, the ſign of his eternal

eternal Union with his Church: We ſhall not have any difficulty to comprehend that the Marriage of the Faithful is accompanied by the Holy Ghoſt, and by Grace; and we ſhall praiſe the Divine bounty for having been thus pleaſed to Conſecrate the origin of our birth.

Orders.

The Impoſition of Hands, which the Adminſtrators of ſacred things receive, being accompanied with ſo apparent a vertue of the Holy Ghoſt and ſo full an infuſion of his Grace, it ought to be placed amongſt the number of the Sacraments. And indeed we muſt acknowledge our Adverſaries do not abſolutely exclude the Conſecration of Miniſters, but only exclude it from the number of the Sacraments which are *common to the whole Church.*

1 Tim. 4. *2 Tim.* 2. Conf. de Foy, Art. 35.

SECT. X.

Doctrine of the Church touching the Real Preſence of the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST *in the Euchariſt, and the manner how the Church underſtands theſe Words,* This is my Body.

WE are come, you ſee, at laſt to the Queſtion of the Euchariſt, where it will be neceſſary to explicate our Doctrine more fully, however without exceeding too much the Bounds we have preſcribed our ſelves.

The Real Preſence of the Body and Blood of our Saviour is ſolidly eſtabliſhed by the Words of the Inſtitution, which we underſtand literally; and there is no more reaſon to ask us, why we fix our ſelves to the proper and literal ſenſe, than there is to ask a Traveller why he follows the high Road. It is their parts, who have recourſe to the figurative ſenſe, and who take by-paths, to give a Reaſon for what they do. As for us, who find nothing in the words which *JESUS CHRIST* makes uſe of for the Inſtitution of this Myſtery obliging us to take them in a figurative ſenſe, we think that a ſufficient Reaſon to determine us to the literal. But we are yet more powerfully engaged, when we come to conſider in this Myſtery the Intention of the Son of God, which I will explicate after the Plaineſt manner I am able, and that by Principles which I think our Adverſaries themſelves cannot deny.

I ſay then, Theſe words of our Saviour *Take eat, this is my body given for you*, ſhews us, that as the ancient Jews did not in Spirit only unite themſelves to the Immolation of the Victim which was offered for them, but that in reality they eat the ſacrificed Fleſh, which was to them a mark of their partaking of that Oblation: So *JESUS CHRIST* becoming himſelf our Victim, would have us really eat of the fleſh of his

Matth. 16. *Luc.* 22.

Sacrifice, to the end the actual Communication of this Adorable Fleſh might be a perpetual Teſtimony to every one of us in particular, that it was for us he took it, and for us he Immolated it.

Levit. 6. 30. God had forbidden the *Jews* to eat of the Sin-offering, to teach them, that a true Expiation of their Crimes was not to be accompliſhed in the Law, nor by the Blood of Beaſts: all the People lay, as it were, under an Interdiction by this Prohibition, without being able to have any actual Participation of the Remiſſion of Sins. By a contrary Reaſon it was neceſſary the Body of our Bleſſed Saviour, the true Hoſt Immolated for Sin, ſhould be eaten by the Faithful, to ſhow them, by this Eating, that the Remiſſion of Sin was accompliſhed in the New Teſtament.

Levit. 17. 11. God alſo forbid the Children of *Iſrael* to eat Blood; and one of the Reaſons for this Prohibition was, Becauſe the *Blood was given us for the Expiation of our Souls.* But, on the contrary, our Bleſſed Saviour gives

Matth. 36. 18. us his Blood to drink, becauſe *it is ſhed for the Remiſſion of Sins.*

So that the Eating of the Body and Blood of the Son of God is as real at the Holy Table, as the Grace, the Expiation of Sins, and the Participation of the Sacrifice of *JESUS CHRIST* is actual and real in the New Covenant.

Nevertheleſs, ſeeing he deſired to exerciſe our Faith in this Myſtery, and at the ſame time to free us from the horror of eating Fleſh, and drinking Blood in their proper Species, it was convenient he ſhould give us them clothed under another Species. But if the Conſiderations have obliged him to make us partake of the Fleſh of our Victim after another manner than the *Jews*, he was not for that obliged to deprive us in the leaſt of the Reality of his Subſtance.

It appears then, that *JESUS CHRIST*, to accompliſh the ancient Figures, and to put us in actual Poſſeſſion of the Victim offered for our Sins, had intention to give us really his Body and Blood. Which is ſo evident, that our Adverſaries themſelves would have us believe they are of the ſame opinion with us in this, perpetually repeating how they deny not the actual Preſence, nor the real Participation of the Body and Blood in the Euchariſt. This we will examine hereafter, where we think it neceſſary to repreſent their Sentiments, after we have finiſhed the Explication of thoſe of the Church. But in the mean time we will conclude, That if the plainneſs of our Saviours Words has forced them to acknowledge his expreſs intention was to give us in reality his Fleſh, when he ſaid, *This is my Body*, they ought not to be aſtoniſhed, if we cannot conſent to underſtand theſe Words only in Figure.

In reality, it appears that the Son of God, who was ſo careful to explain to his Apoſtles what he taught them under Parables and Figures, having ſaid nothing here to explicate himſelf, left theſe Words in their natural

natural Signification. I know these Gentlemen pretend the Nature of the Thing explains it self sufficiently, because we see very well, say they, what he presents us is nothing but Bread and Wine; but this Reason vanishes, when we consider, he who speaks has an Authority which over-rules the Senses, and a Power which has Dominion over Universal Nature.

The Son of God has no more difficulty to render his Body present in the Eucharist, by saying, *This is my Body*, than to cure a Woman of her Infirmity, by saying, *Woman, thou art freed from thy Infirmity*; or to preserve the Life of a young Man, by saying to his Father, *Thy Son liveth*; or to forgive the Sins of a Man sick of the Palsie, by saying to him, *Thy sins are forgiven thee.* *Luc.* 13. 12. *John* 4. 50. *Matth.* 9. 2.

So that we rest precisely upon his Words, not troubling our selves how he will execute what he has said. He who do's what he will, by speaking do's what he pleases; and it was more easie for the Son of God to force the Laws of Nature to verifie his Word, than it is for us to accommodate our Understandings to these kind of violent Interpretations, which break the Laws of common Discourse.

These Laws of Discourse teach us, That a Sign which represents a thing naturally, receives often the Name of the Thing represented, it being as it were its Nature to bring the Idea of the thing into the Mind. The same also happens, tho' with some restriction, to instituted Signs, when they are received, and Persons accustomed to them. But that, in establishing a Sign, which has no relation to the thing, as for example, a Morsel of Bread to signifie the Body of a Man, the Name of the thing signified should be given to it without any Explication, and before any Agreement, as JESUS CHRIST has done in his last Supper, is a thing unheard of, and of which we find no Example in Holy Writ, not to say in any Language. Neither do the Gentlemen of the Pretended Reform'd Religion so fix themselves to the Figurative Sense, which they would give to these Words of JESUS CHRIST, but that at the same time they acknowledge, he had intention in pronouncing them to give us in reality his Body and Blood.

SECT. XI.

Explication of these Words, Do this in remembrance of me.

AFter having proposed the Sentiments of the Church, touching these Words, *This is my Body*, we must explicate what she thinks of those others, which JESUS CHRIST added, *Do this in remembrance of me.* It is manifest, the Intention of the Son of God is to oblige us by these Words to remember the Death which he has endured for our Salvation, and St. *Paul* concludes from these same Words, That we *declare the Death* *Luc.* 22. 19. 1 *Cor.* 11. 24. 1 *Cor.* 11. 26.

of

of our Saviour in this Myſtery. But they muſt not perſwade themſelves, the Remembrance of our Saviour's Death excludes the Real Preſence of his Body: on the contrary, if they conſider what we have lately explicated, they will clearly underſtand this Commemoration to be grounded upon the Real Preſence. For as the *Jews* in eating of the Peace-Offerings remembred they had been Immolated for them; in the ſame manner, in eating of the Fleſh of *JESUS CHRIST* our Victim, we ought to remember he died for us. This very Fleſh then, eaten by the Faithful, not only renews in us the Memory of his Immolation, but confirms alſo the Reality of it to us. And we are ſo far from having reaſon to ſay, that this ſolemn Commemoration, which *JESUS CHRIST* ordains us to make, excludes the Preſence of his Body; that, on the contrary, we ſee this tender Remembrance which he would have us to make at the Holy Table of him, as Immolated for us, is grounded upon This; That this very Fleſh ought to be there taken Really, ſeeing in effect it is not poſſible for us to forget it was for us he gave his Body in Sacrifice, when we ſee he daily gives us the ſame Victim to eat.

Muſt Chriſtians, under pretenſe of Celebrating in the Lords Supper the Memory of the Paſſion of our Saviour, deprive this Pious Commemoration of what it has moſt efficacious and tender in it? Ought they not to conſider, that JESUS CHRIST do's not command them only to remember him, but to remember him in Eating of his Fleſh and Blood? Conſider the Connexion and the Force of his Words. He do's not ſay ſimply, as thoſe of the Pretended Reformation ſeem to underſtand him, That the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt ſhould be to us a *Memorial* of his Body and Blood; but he advertiſes us, that in doing what he has preſcrib'd, that is, in receiving his Body and Blood, we ſhould remember him. What is there in reality more powerful to make us remember him? And if Children do ſo tenderly remember their Parents, and their Bounties towards them, when they approach the Tombs where their Bodies are Interr'd; how ought our Remembrance and our Love to be excited, when we poſſeſs under theſe ſacred Vails, under this myſtical Sepulchre, this Living and Life-giving Fleſh, and this Blood yet flowing with his Love, and full of Spirit and Grace? But if our Adverſaries continue to tell us, That he who commands us to remember him, does not give us his proper Subſtance, we muſt, in fine, deſire them to agree amongſt themſelves. They profeſs, they deny not the Real Communication of the proper Subſtance of the Son of God in the Euchariſt. If their Words are ſerious, if their Doctrine be not an Illuſion, they muſt neceſſarily ſay with us, The Remembrance does not exclude all kinds of Preſence, but only that which ſtrikes the Senſes. Their Anſwer ſhall be ours, ſeeing that, tho' we affirm *JESUS CHRIST* to be preſent, yet we acknowledge at the ſame time he is not preſent after a ſenſible manner.

And

And if it ſhould be demanded, how it comes to paſs, that believing as we do, the Senſes to have nothing to do in this Myſtery, we ſhould not believe it ſufficient that *JESUS CHRIST* ſhould be preſent by Faith: It is eaſie to anſwer, and to clear this Equivocal Objection. It is one thing to ſay, the Son of God is preſent to us by Faith, and another thing to ſay, we know by Faith that he is preſent. The firſt manner of ſpeaking, imports only a Moral Preſence; but the ſecond ſignifies to us a very Real one, becauſe our Faith is moſt Real; and this Real Preſence known by Faith, is ſufficient to work all the foremention'd Effects in the *Juſt Man, who lives by Faith.* *Habac.* 2. 4.

SECT. XII.

Expoſition of the Calviniſts *Doctrine concerning the Real Preſence.*

BUT to remove all Equivocations which *Calviniſts* make uſe of in this matter, and ſhow, at the ſame time, how near they have approached to us, it will be convenient to add here the Expoſition of their Sentiments, tho' I only undertook to explicate the Doctrine of the Church.

Their Doctrine has two parts; the one ſpeaks of nothing but the Figure, and the other of nothing but the Reality of the *Body* and *Blood.* We ſhall ſee each of theſe parts in Order.

They tell us firſt, This great Miracle of the Real Preſence, which we admit, is uſeleſs; that it is enough for our Salvation, JESUS CHRIST died for us; that his Sacrifice is ſufficiently applied to us by Faith; and that this Application is certified to us by the Word of God. They add, That if this Word muſt be clothed with ſenſible Signs, it is enough to give ſimple Symbols, ſuch as the Water of Baptiſm, without any neceſſity of fetching the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST from Heaven.

There ſeems to be nothing more eaſie than this manner of explicating the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. Nevertheleſs, our Adverſaries themſelves do not think it ought to ſuffice them. They know ſuch kind of imaginations made the *Socinians* deny the great Miracle of the Incarnation. God might have ſaved us, ſay theſe Heretics, without ſo much difficulty; he had nothing to do, but to Pardon our faults, and might have inſtructed us ſufficiently, as well in Faith, as in Manners, by the Preaching and Examples of a Man full of the Holy Ghoſt, without any need of making him a God. But the *Calviniſts*, as well as we, ſee the weakneſs of this Argument, which appears firſt from its not appertaining to us to deny or affirm Myſteries, according as they appear to us uſeful or unprofitable to our Salvation. God alone knows the Secret; and it is our buſineſs to render them uſeful and ſaving to us, in believing them as he propoſes them, and in receiving his Graces

after

after the manner he beſtows them on us. Secondly, not to enter into the Queſtion, whether it was Poſſible for God to ſave us by any other means than the Incarnation, and Death of his Son, and not to meddle with that unneceſſary Diſpute, which the Pretended Reform'd Religion treats of ſo at length in the Schools, it ſuffices we have learnt from the Scriptures, that the Son of God has been pleaſed to teſtifie his Love to us by incomprehenſible Effects. This love has been the Cauſe of this ſo Real an Union, by which he was made Man. This Love moved him to Immolate the *ſame Body* for us, as really as he united himſelf to it. All theſe deſigns are conſecutive, and this Love maintains it ſelf in all things with the ſame vigour. So that, when it ſhall pleaſe him to make each of his Children experience the goodneſs he has teſtified to all in general, by giving himſelf to them in particular, he will find out a method to accompliſh his Deſires, by no leſs efficacious means, than thoſe by which he had already accompliſhed our Salvation. Upon which account we muſt not be hereafter aſtoniſhed, if he give to each of us the proper Subſtance of his Body and Blood. He does it that he may imprint in our Hearts, that it was for us he took them, and for us he offered them up in Sacrifice. That which preceeded, makes all that follows credible to us; the Order of his Myſteries diſpoſe us to believe all this; and his expreſs word permits us not to doubt of it.

Our Adverſaries ſaw very well, that ſimple figures and ſigns of his Body and Blood would not content Chriſtians, who are accuſtomed to the bounties of a God, who gives himſelf to us ſo really. Wherefore they will not ſuffer us to accuſe them of denying a real and ſubſtantial Participation of JESUS CHRIST in their Supper. They affirm, as well as we, that he makes us there Partakers *of his proper Subſtance*; they tell us, that he *nouriſhes and quickens us with the ſubſtance of his Body and Blood*; and judging it would not be enough to ſhew us, by ſome ſign, that we are Partakers of his Sacrifice, they ſay expreſly, that the *Body of our Saviour, which is given us in the laſt Supper, aſſures us of it:* Words very remarkable, which we will examin by and by.

Cat. Dim. 53. Conf. of Faith, *art.* 36.

Cat. Dim. 52.

Behold then the Body and Blood of JESUS CHRIST preſent in our Myſteries, by the acknowledgement of the *Calviniſts*: For what is Communicated *according to its proper ſubſtance*, muſt be really preſent. It is true, they explicate this Communication, by ſaying, it is in *Spirit*, and by *Faith*: but it is true alſo, they will have it Real. And becauſe it is impoſſible to make it intelligible how a Body, that is Communicated to us only in Spirit, and by Faith, can be Communicated to us really, and in its proper ſubſtance, therefore they have not been able to continue firm in the two parts of a Doctrine ſo contradictory, and they have been obliged to acknowledg two things which cannot be true, but by ſuppoſing what the Catholic Church teacheth.

The firſt is, That JESUS CHRIST is given to us in the Euchariſt after

after a manner which neither agrees with that of Baptiſm, nor the Preaching of the Goſpel, but is peculiar to this Myſtery. We ſhall ſee by and by the Conſequence of this Principle: But let us firſt ſee how it is granted us by thoſe of the Pretended Reformation.

I will not here alledg the Authority of any particular Author, but the proper words of their Catechiſm, where it explicates what concerns the laſt Supper. It do's not only tell us in expreſs terms, that *JESUS CHRIST* is given us in the Supper, in reality, and according to his *proper Subſtance*, but that, *tho' he be truly Communicated to us, both by Baptiſm, and the Goſpel, yet nevertheleſs, it is only in part, and not fully.* From whence it follows, that he is given us in the Lords Supper fully, and not in part. *Dim.* 53.

There is a vaſt difference betwixt receiving in part, and receiving fully. If then we receive *JESUS CHRIST* every where elſe in part, and it be only in the Lords Supper, we receive him fully; it follows by the conſent of our Adverſaries, that we muſt look out for a participation in the laſt Supper which is proper only to this Myſtery, and which do's not agree with Baptiſm and Preaching; but at the ſame time it follows alſo, that this participation is not annexed to Faith, becauſe Faith being generally diſperſed through all the Actions of a Chriſtian, is found in Preaching and in Baptiſm, as well as in the Lords Supper: In reality, it is remarkable, that what deſire ſoever the Pretended Reformers had to render Baptiſm and Preaching equal to the laſt Supper, becauſe *JESUS CHRIST* is there truly Communicated to us, they durſt never affirm in their Catechiſms, that *JESUS CHRIST* is given us in his proper Subſtance, by Baptiſm and Preaching, as they ſay he is given in the Euchariſt. They ſaw then, they could not avoid attributing to the Euchariſt a manner of poſſeſſing *JESUS CHRIST* peculiar only to this Sacrament; and that Faith, which is common to all the Actions of a Chriſtian, could not be this particular manner. But this peculiar manner of poſſeſſing *JESUS CHRIST* in the laſt Supper ought alſo to be Real, ſeeing it gives to the Faithful the proper ſubſtance of the Body and Blood of *JESUS CHRIST*. So that we muſt conclude, from what they grant us, there is in the Euchariſt a Real manner of receiving the Body and Blood of our Saviour, which is not performed by Faith; and this is what the Catholic Church teaches.

The ſecond thing granted by the Pretended Reformers, is taken out of that Article which immediately follows that which I have already cited out of their Catechiſm; which is, *That the Body of our Lord* JESUS *for as much as it was once offered up in Sacrifice to reconcile us to God, is now given to aſſure us, we have a part in that Reconciliation.* *Dim.* 52.

If there be any Senſe in theſe Words, if they be not an uſeleſs ſound, and a vain amuſement, we ought to underſtand by them, that *JESUS CHRIST* do's not give us a Symbol only, but his proper Body, to aſſure

us we partake of his Sacrifice, and of the Reconciliation of Mankind. But if the reception of the Body of our Lord aſſures us of our participation of the Fruits of his Death; this participation of the Fruits muſt neceſſarily be diſtinguiſhed from the reception of the Body, ſeeing one is the pledg of the other. From whence, to proceed, I ſay, If our Adverſaries are forced to diſtinguiſh in the laſt Supper the participation of the Body of our Bleſſed Saviour, from the participation of the Fruits of his Grace in his Sacrifice, they muſt alſo neceſſarily make a diſtinction between the participation of this Divine Body, and all kinds of Spiritual participation by Faith. This latter participation will never furniſh them with two diſtinct Actions, by one of which they receive the Body of our Saviour, and by the other, the benefit of this Sacrifice; no Man being able to conceive what difference there is betwixt partaking by Faith of the Body of our Saviour, and partaking by Faith of the Fruit of his Death. They muſt therefore acknowledge, that beſides the Communion, by which we ſpiritually partake of the Body of our Saviour, and alſo of his Spirit, by receiving the fruit of his Death; there is alſo a Real Communion of the Body of the ſame Saviour, which is to us a certain Pledge of the others being aſſured to us, if we put no impediment to ſuch a Grace by an evil Diſpoſition. This is neceſſarily included in the Principles they admit, and they will never be able to explicate this Truth, with the leaſt ſhadow of Solidity, if they return not to the Sentiments of the Church.

Who will not here admire the force of Truth? All the conſequences which follow from the acknowledged Principles of our Adverſaries, are perfectly underſtood in the Sentiment of the Church-Catholic; the moſt meanly inſtructed, without difficulty conceive, that in the Euchariſt there is a Communion with *JESUS CHRIST*, which is not to be found any where elſe. It is no difficulty for them to underſtand his Body *is given us, to aſſure us we partake of his Sacrifice and of his Death.* They diſtinguiſh clearly betwixt theſe two neceſſary manners of uniting our ſelves to *JESUS CHRIST*; the one, in receiving his proper Fleſh; the other, in receiving his Spirit: the firſt of which is granted us, as a certain Pledge of the Second. But ſeeing theſe things are inexplicable in the Sentiments of our Adverſaries, tho on the other hand they cannot deny them, we muſt neceſſarily conclude, that Errour has thrown them into a manifeſt Contradiction.

I have been often aſtoniſhed they did not explicate their Doctrine after a more plain manner. Why did they not always, without ſo many Formalities, perſevere to ſay, that *JESUS CHRIST* having ſhed his Blood for us, repreſented to us this effuſion, by giving us two diſtinct ſigns of his Body and Blood; that he was pleaſed indeed to give to theſe ſigns the name of the thing it ſelf: that theſe Sacred Signs were Pledges to aſſure us of our partaking of the Fruit of his Death, and that we were

ſpiritually

ſpiritually nouriſhed by the vertue of his Body and Blood? After ſo many endeavours to prove that ſigns often receive the names of the things ſignified, and that for this reaſon the ſign of the Body might be called the Body, all this connection of Doctrine obliges them naturally to fix there. To render theſe ſigns efficacious, it ſufficed the Grace of Redemption was annexed to them, or rather, according to their Principles, that it was in them confirmed to us. They needed not have tormented themſelves, as they have done, to make us underſtand we receive the proper Body of our Saviour, to aſſure us we partake of the Grace of his Death. They were well enough ſatisfied to have the Water of Baptiſm a ſign of the Blood which waſheth us; and it never entred into their fancies to ſay, we there received the proper ſubſtance of the Blood of our Bleſſed Saviour, to aſſure us his vertue is there diffuſed upon us. If they had argued after the ſame manner as to the Euchariſt, their Doctrine would have been leſs embroyled. But thoſe who invent and innovate, cannot expreſs all they have a mind to. They find certain truths, and maxims eſtabliſhed which incommode them, and force a violence upon their Imaginations. The *Arians* would gladly have refuſed our Bleſſed Saviour the name of God, or the only Son of God. The *Neſtorians* did not admit, but with reluctance, that kind of I know not what Unity of perſon in *JESUS CHRIST*, which we find in their Writings. The *Pelagians*, who denied Original ſin, would alſo willingly have denied that Baptiſm was given to little Children for the remiſſion of ſins: for by that means they would have been freed from the Argument which Catholics drew from this practice to prove that Original defect. But, as I juſt now ſaid, thoſe who find ſome truths firmly eſtabliſhed, have not the boldneſs, or rather impudence to overthrow all. Let the *Calviniſts* ingenuouſly confeſs the truth; they would have been well pleaſed to acknowledge in the Euchariſt the Body of our Bleſſed Saviour only figuratively, and the ſole participation of his Spirit in effect, laying aſide thoſe great words of *Participation of his proper ſubſtance*, and the many others which import a Real Preſence, and ſerve only to perplex them. It would have been more to their humour, to have acknowledged, in the Lords Supper, no other Communion with *JESUS CHRIST*, but what is alſo common to Preaching and to Baptiſm, without telling us, as they have done, that in the Lords Supper *he is received in plenitude*, and every where elſe only *in part*. But however this was their Inclination, yet the very force of the terms oppoſe them, our Bleſſed Saviour having ſaid ſo preciſely of the Euchariſt, *This is my Body*, *This is my Blood*; which he never did of any other thing, nor upon any other occaſion; what likelihood was there of rendring that common to all the Actions of a Chriſtian, which his expreſs word had annexed to one particular *Sacrament*? And farther, the whole order of Divine Providence, the connexion of Doctrine and Holy Myſteries, the intention of *JESUS CHRIST* in his

laſt Supper, the words themſelves which he uttered, and the impreſſion which they naturally form in the minds of the Faithful, give us nothing but the Ideas of his Real preſence. Therefore it was neceſſary our Adverſaries ſhould find out ſome expreſſions, the ſound of which might, at leaſt, give us a confuſed Idea of this reality. When a man fixes himſelf either entirely upon Faith, as Catholics do; or entirely upon Human Reaſon, as Infidels do; it is eaſie for him to eſtabliſh a connected and uniform model of Doctrine. But when a man goes about to make a compoſition of one and the other, he always ſays ſomething which he would not ſay, and afterwards falls into opinions, the ſole Contrarieties of which ſhew the Manifeſt falſity of them.

This is what has happened to theſe *Gentlemen* of the *Pretended Reform'd Religion*; and God has ſo permitted it, to facilitate their return to *Catholic Unity*. For, whereas their proper experience ſhews them, they muſt neceſſarily *expreſs themſelves as we do*, to *ſpeak the Language of Truth*; ought they not to judge it neceſſary to *think as we do*, to *underſtand it Right*? If they obſerve in *their own Belief* many expreſſions which have no ſenſe but according to *our Tenets*, is it not ſufficient to convince them, that *Truth* is not in its *full perfection but amongſt us*? And ought not thoſe *unconnected parts of Catholic Doctrine*, which are ſcattered here and there in their *Catechiſms*, but which, as I may ſay, require to be United to the whole; ought they not, I ſay, to excite them to ſearch, in the *Communion of the Church*, *a full and entire explication of the Myſtery of the Euchariſt*? They would, no doubt, be brought to it, did not *humane reflections* trouble and perplex their *Faith*, which has too much dependence upon *ſenſe*. But having ſhewn what *Fruit* they ought to Reap from the *Expoſition of their Doctrine*, let us finiſh the *Explication of our own*.

SECT. XIII.

Of Tranſubſtantiation and Adoration, and in what ſenſe the Euchariſt is ſaid to be a Sign.

IT having been Convenient, as was ſaid before, that the Senſes ſhould not perceive any thing in this Myſtery of Faith, it was neceſſary nothing ſhould be changed, in reſpect of them, in the Bread and Wine of the Euchariſt. Upon which account, being we ſee the ſame Species, and feel the ſame Effects as before in this Sacrament, we muſt not wonder, if the ſame name be given to them ſometimes, and in ſome certain ſenſe. Yet notwithſtanding, Faith being attentive to His word, who performs what pleaſes him in Heaven and on Earth, acknowledges here no other Subſtance, but what is deſigned by the ſame word, that is to ſay, the proper Body and Blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*, into which the Bread and

and Wine are changed; this is what we call *Tranſubſtantiation.*

However, that Real Verity which is interiorly contained in the Euchariſt, hinders not the exterior and ſenſible part from being a ſign; but a ſign of ſuch a Nature, that it is ſo far from excluding the Reality of the thing ſignified, it bears it neceſſarily along with it, ſeeing that in effect, theſe words, *This is my Body*, pronounc'd upon that matter, which JESUS CHRIST himſelf made choice of, is to us a certain ſign that his Body is preſent, and tho the Symbols appear always the ſame to our Senſes, yet our Mind Judges otherwiſe of them, and not according to Senſe; becauſe a ſuperior Authority interpoſes. So that, whereas certain Species, and a certain ſequel of natural impreſſions on our Senſes, have been accuſtomed to deſign to us the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, the Authority of Him, in whom we believe, cauſes theſe ſame Species to begin to ſhew us another ſubſtance. For we give ear to him who ſaid, that *this, which we receive and eat, is his Body*; and ſuch is the force of theſe words, as they hinder us from referring thoſe exterior appearances to the ſubſtance of Bread, and induce us to refer them to the Body of JESUS CHRIST there preſent: Inſomuch that the Preſence of ſuch an adorable Object being rendered certain to us by this ſign, we are not afraid to pay it our Adorations.

I will not dwell upon the point of Adoration, becauſe the moſt learned and moſt intelligent of our Adverſaries have long ſince granted us, thoſe who are perſwaded of the Real preſence of *JESUS CHRIST* in the Euchariſt ought to pay him in it their Adorations.

In fine, being once convinced, the all-powerful words of the Son of God Operate whatever they declare, we believe that in the laſt Supper, they had their effect as ſoon as they were pronounced by him; and by a neceſſary Conſequence we acknowledg the Real Preſence of his Body, before our receiving of it.

SECT. XIV.

Sacrifice of the Maſs.

THeſe things being ſuppoſed, there remains no particular difficulty about the Sacrifice which we acknowledg in the Euchariſt.

We have Obſerved two actions in this Myſtery, which ceaſe not to be diſtinct, tho one of them has a Relation to the other. The firſt is the Conſecration, by which the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood; and the ſecond is the receiving, by which we partake of them.

In the Conſecration, the Body and the Blood are myſtically ſeparated becauſe JESUS CHRIST ſaid ſeparately, *This is my Body, this is my Blood*; which includes a lively and efficatious Repreſentation of the violent Death he ſuffered.

So

So that the Son of God is placed upon the Holy Table, in vertue of these words, cloathed with those signs which Represent his Death; this is effected by Consecration; and this Religious action carries with it an acknowledgment of Gods Soveraignty, in as much as *Jesus Christ* there present, renews and perpetuates, in some sort, the Remembrance of his being Obedient, even to the death of the Cross: So that there is nothing wanting to render this a true Sacrifice.

We cannot doubt but this Action, as distinct from that of Communicating, is of it self acceptable to God, and makes him look upon us with a more propitious Eye, because it Represents to him that voluntary Death which his beloved Son has suffered for us Sinners, or rather places before his Eyes that very Son of his, under the signs of this Death, by which his Wrath had been appeased.

All Christians will confess the sole Presence of *JESUS CHRIST* to be a most Powerful Intercession before God for all mankind; according to the saying of the Apostle, that *Jesus Christ presents himself and appears for us before the Face of God.* So that we believe *Jesus Christ* being present upon the Holy Table, under this Figure of Death, intercedes for us, and Represents continually to his Father that death which he has suffered for his Church. *Heb* 9. 24.

It is in this Sense we say, *Jesus Christ* offers up himself to God for us in the Eucharist; it is after this manner we conceive this Oblation renders God more propitious to us, and therefore we call this a Propitiatory Sacrifice.

When we consider what it is, *Jesus Christ* Operates in this Mystery, and when we see him by Faith present upon this Holy Table, together with these Signs of death, we Unite our selves to him in this Estate; we present him to God, as our only Victim, and our sole Propitiator by his Blood, confessing we have nothing to offer up to God but *Jesus Christ*, and the infinite Merit of his Death. We Consecrate all our Prayers by this Holy Oblation, and in presenting *Jesus Christ*, to God, we learn at the same time, to offer up our selves to the Divine Majesty in him, and by him, as living Sacrifices.

This is the Sacrifice of Christians, infinitely different from what was offered up in the Old Law: A Spiritual Sacrifice becoming the New Covenant, in which the presence of the Victim is only perceived by Faith; in which the Word of God is the Spiritual Sword which makes a Mystical seperation betwixt the Body and the Blood; in which by consequence the Blood is only shed Mystically, and in which Death only intervenes by Representation: And yet however a most Real Sacrifice, in as much as *Jesus Christ* is there truly contained, and presented to his Father, under this Figure of Death: But a Commemorative Sacrifice, which is so far from taking away our adhesion to the Sacrifice of the Cross (as it is objected to us) on the contrary, it fixes

fixes us the firmer to it by all its circumſtances; ſeeing it has not only an entire relation to it, but in reality, has neither being nor ſubſiſtence but by this relation, from whence it deriveth all the Vertue contained in it.

This is the expreſs Doctrine of the Catholic Church in the Council of *Trent*, which teaches, that this Sacrifice is inſtituted only *to repreſent that which was once accompliſhed upon the Croſs; to perpetuate the memory of it to the end of the World; and to apply to us the ſaving Vertue of it for the remiſſion of thoſe ſins which we commit every day.* So that the Church is ſo far from believing, that ſomething wants to perfect the Sacrifice of the Croſs; on the contrary, ſhe thinks it ſo perfect, and ſo fully ſufficient, as what is added, is only inſtituted to celebrate the Memory, and apply its Vertue. *Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1.

By which the ſame Church acknowledges, that all the merit of the Redemption of Mankind depends upon the Death of the Son of God; and it ought to be underſtood, from all we have already expounded, that when we ſay to God in the Celebration of the Divine Myſtery, *We offer unto you this Holy Hoſt*, we pretend not by this Oblation, to make, or preſent to God a new payment of the price of our Salvation, but to offer up to him in our behalfs, the Merits of our Bleſſed *JESUS* there preſent, and the infinite price which he once paid for us upon the Croſs.

The Gentlemen of the Pretended Reform'd Religion do not think they offend *JESUS CHRIST*, by offering him to God as preſent to their Faith; and if they believed him to be really there, what repugnance could they have to offer him up as truly preſent; So that the whole diſpute ought indeed to be reduced to the Real Preſence alone.

From hence forwards, all thoſe falſe Ideas, which theſe Gentlemen of the Pretended Reform'd Religion form to themſelves of the Sacrifice which we offer, ought to be effaced. They ought freely to acknowledge Catholics pretend not to make a new propitiation to appeaſe God a freſh, as if he had not been ſufficiently ſatisfied by the Sacrifice of the Croſs; or to make ſome addition to the Price of our Salvation, as if it were imperfect. All theſe things have no place in our Doctrine; becauſe all that is here done, is intended by way of Interceſſion and Application, as we have now explicated.

SECT. XV.

The Epiſtle to the Hebrews.

AFter this Explication, thoſe mighty Objections drawn from the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and ſo much enforced againſt us, will appear to have little reaſon in them: and it is in vain our Adverſaries ſtrive to prove, from the ſentiments of the Apoſtle, that we annul the Sacrifice of the Croſs. But becauſe the beſt way to prove that two Doctrines are

not

not oppoſite to one another, is to ſhew, by explicating them, that no Propoſitions of the one is contrary to the Propoſitions of the other; I think I am bound in this place to propoſe in ſhort the Doctrine of this Epiſtle.

The Apoſtle intends in this Epiſtle to teach us, that a ſinner could not avoid Death, but by ſubſtituting ſome one in his place to die for him; that whilſt Men ſubſtituted only Beaſts to be killed in their places, their Sacrifices operated nothing, but a publick acknowledgment of their having deſerved Death; and that, ſeeing the Divine Juſtice could not be ſatisfied by ſo unequal an exchange, they begun again every day to ſlay new Victims; which was a certain mark of the inſufficiency of that ſubſtitution: But that, ſince *JESUS CHRIST* had vouchſafed to die for Sinners, God being ſatisfied, by the free Oblation of ſo worthy a Perſon ſubſtituting himſelf, he had nothing more to exact for the price of our Redemption. From whence the Apoſtle concludes, we ought not only to offer up no more Victims after *JESUS CHRIST*, but that *JESUS CHRIST* himſelf ought to be but once offered up to Death for us.

Let the Reader then, who is ſolicitous for his Souls Salvation, and a lover of Truth, reflect a little upon what we have ſaid concerning the manner how JESUS CHRIST offers up himſelf to God for us in the Euchariſt; I am certain, he will not find any Propoſition contrary to thoſe I have here related from the Apoſtle; or which weakens his Argument; ſo that nothing can be objected to us, but his ſilence upon this point. But thoſe who would but conſider the wiſe diſtribution which God makes of his ſecrets in the ſeveral Books of Scripture, would not oblige us to receive, from the ſole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, all our inſtructions concerning a matter which was not neceſſary to the Subject of that Epiſtle; ſeeing the Apoſtle intends to explicate in it, the perfection of the Sacrifice of the Croſs, and not the different manners which God has inſtituted to apply it to us.

And to remove all Equivocation, if we take the word *Offer* in the ſenſe it is made uſe of in this Epiſtle, as implying the actual Death of the Victim, we will publickly confeſs, that JESUS CHRIST is now no more offered up, neither in the Euchariſt, nor any where elſe. But becauſe this word has a larger ſignification in other places of Scripture, where it is often ſaid, We offer up to God what we preſent before him; the Church, which forms her Language, and her Doctrine not from the ſole Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, but from the whole Body of the Holy Scripture, is not afraid to ſay, that JESUS CHRIST offers up himſelf to God wherever he appears before his Face upon our behalf, and that by conſequence, he offers up himſelf in the Euchariſt, according to the Holy Fathers expreſſions.

Now to imagine this manner, of JESUS CHRIST's, preſenting himſelf to God, ſhould injure the Sacrifice of the Croſs, is what cannot in any kind be ſuppoſed without overthrowing the whole Scripture, and particularly

particularly this Epiſtle, which is ſo vehemently objected againſt us. For it muſt, by the ſame reaſon, be concluded, that when *JESUS CHRIST* offered up himſelf to God, *In entring into the World*, to ſubſtitute himſelf in place of thoſe Victims *which could not pleaſe him*, he injured that Action by which he offered up himſelf upon the Croſs; that when he *continues to appear before God for us*, he weakens that Oblation *by which he appeared once, by the immolation of himſelf*; and that *not ceaſing to intercede for us*, he accuſes of inſufficiency that interceſſion which he made in dying with *ſo many tears, and ſuch an exclamation.* *Heb.* 10. 5. *Heb.* 9. 24. *Heb.* 9. 26. *Heb.* 7. 25. *Heb.* 5. 7.

All this would be ridiculous. We muſt therefore underſtand, that *JESUS CHRIST*, who once offered up himſelf to be the humble Victim of the Divine Juſtice, do's not ceaſe to offer up himſelf always for us; that the infinite perfection of the Sacrifice of the Croſs conſiſts in this, that whatſoever preceded it, as well as what follows it, has an entire reference to it: that as what preceded it, was a preparation to it; ſo that which follows it, is the conſummation and application of it; that in reality the payment of the price of our Redemption is no more reiterated, becauſe it was fully diſcharg'd the firſt time; but that what applys that Redemption to us, continues without ceaſing; laſtly, that we muſt make a diſtinction betwixt the things which are reiterated as imperfect, and thoſe which are continued as perfect and neceſſary.

SECT. XVI.

Reflections upon the preceding Doctrine.

WE conjure all thoſe of the Pretended Reformation, to make ſome little Reflection upon what has been ſaid concerning the Euchariſt.

The Doctrine of the Real Preſence has been the neceſſary foundation of it. This Foundation is impugned by the *Calviniſts*. There is nothing appears more important than this in our Controverſies; ſeeing the Queſtion is concerning the Real Preſence of *JESUS CHRIST* himſelf. There is nothing our Adverſaries find more difficult to believe. And there is nothing in which we are ſo directly oppoſite, as in this.

In moſt other Diſputes, when theſe Gentlemen hear us with calmneſs, they find the difficulties vaniſh, and that they are more offended with words, than with the things themſelves. On the contrary, upon this ſubject we agree more about the manner of ſpeaking; becauſe both ſides uſe the words of *Real Participation*, and the like: But the fuller we explicate our ſelves, the more we find our ſelves oppoſed; becauſe our Adverſaries do not receive all the Conſequences of thoſe truths which they admit, being diſcouraged (as I ſaid) by the difficulties which Senſe and Human Reaſon find in theſe *conſequences.*

This is therefore, to say truly, the most difficult of our Controversies, and that in which we are most opposite to one another.

Nevertheless God has permitted the *Lutherans* should adhere to the belief of the Real Presence as well as we: And he has also permitted the *Calvinists* should declare this Doctrine to have *no Poyson in it*; that it do's not subvert the foundations of Salvation and Faith; and that it ought not to break Communion betwixt Brethren.

Let those of the *Pretended Reform'd Religion*, who think seriously of their Salvation, render themselves here attentive to that Order, which the Divine Providence makes use of to bring them insensibly nearer to us and Truth. One may either entirely dissipate all the other grounds of their complaints, or at least reduce them to very few Heads, with a little explication. In this where we cannot hope to Conquer by this Method, they have themselves removed the Chief difficulty, by declaring this Doctrine to *contain nothing in it contrary to Salvation, or to the fundamentals of Religion.*

It is true, the *Lutherans*, tho' they concur with us in the ground of the Reality, yet admit not all the Consequences of it. They put Bread together with the Body of *JESUS CHRIST*; some of them reject the Adoration; and they seem to acknowledge the Real Presence only in the Act of Receiving. But all the subtility of the Ministers can never perswade ingenuous and understanding Persons, but that, if they maintain the Real Presence, which is the most important and the most difficult Point, they ought also to maintain the Rest.

Moreover, the same Providence, which labours Secretly for our nearer Union, and lays the Foundations of Reconciliation and of peace in the midst of Bitterness and Disputes, has farther permitted the *Calvinists* to allow, that supposing these words, *This is my Body*, ought to be taken in a literal sense, *Catholics* do reason better and more Consequently than the *Lutherans.*

If I relate not the Passages which have been so often cited on this account, I hope I shall easily be excused, because all those, who are not obstinate, will grant us without difficulty, that the Real Presence being supposed, our Doctrine is that which most naturally follows.

It is then an established Truth, that our Doctrine in this Point contains nothing but the Real Presence rightly understood. But we must not stop there; and we beseech the Pretended Reform'd to consider, we make use of no other things to explicate the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, but only such as are necessarily included in this reality of Presence.

If it should be asked us after this, how it comes then to pass the *Lutherans*, who believe the Real Presence, should nevertheless reject the Sacrifice, which is according to us, only a Consequence of it: Our Answer is in one word, that this Doctrine must be numbred amongst the other Consequences of the Real Presence, which these *Lutherans* have

have not underſtood, and which we have penetrated much better than they, as the *Calviniſts* themſelves Confeſs.

If our explications perſwade theſe laſt, that our Doctrine about the Sacrifice is included in that of the Real Preſence, they ought to ſee clearly that this mighty Diſpute of the Sacrifice of the Maſs, which has filled ſo many Volumes, and occaſioned ſo many Invectives, ought from henceforwards to be retrenched from the body of their Controverſies, becauſe this Point has not now any particular difficulty, and (which is much more important) becauſe this Sacrifice, againſt which they have ſo great repugnance, is no other but a neceſſary Conſequence and a natural explication of a Doctrine, which, according to them, *has no venom in it.* Let them now Examine themſelves, and after this, try before God whether they have ſo much Reaſon, as they imagine, to withdraw themſelves from thoſe Altars, where their fore-Fathers received the Bread of life.

SECT. XVII.

Communion under both kinds.

THere remains one other Conſequence of this Doctrine to be examined, which is, that *JESUS CHRIST* being really preſent in the Sacrament, the grace and Benediction is not annexed to the ſenſible Species, but to the proper ſubſtance of his Fleſh, which is living, and life-giving, becauſe of the Divinity which is United to it. Upon which account, all thoſe who believe the Real preſence, ought not to have any difficulty to Communicate under one ſole Species, becauſe they there receive all that is eſſential to this Sacrament, together with a plenitude ſo ſecure, becauſe there being now no Real ſeparation betwixt the Body and the Blood, (as hath been ſaid) we receive entirely, and without diviſion him, who is ſolely capable to ſatiate us.

This is the ſolid foundation, upon which the Church, interpreting the Precept of Communion has declared, we may receive the Sanctification, which this Sacrament carries with it, under one ſole ſpecies; and if ſhe have reduced her Children to this ſole ſpecies, it was not out of diſeſteem of the other; ſeeing, on the contrary, ſhe did it to hinder thoſe Irreverences, which the confuſion and negligence of people had occaſioned in theſe latter ages, reſerving to her ſelf, the re-eſtabliſhment of Communion under both kinds, according as it ſhould become more advantagious to Peace and Unity.

Catholic Divines have made it appear to thoſe of the Pretended Reformation, how they themſelves have made uſe of ſeveral ſuch like Interpretations, in what belongs to the uſe of the Sacrament; but above all they had reaſon to remark this which is taken out of the 12

12 *Chap.* of their Discipline, Title of the Lords Supper, *Art.* 7. where we find these words: *The Bread of the Lords Supper ought to be administred to those who cannot drink Wine, upon their making protestation, that it is not out of contempt, and endeavouring what they can possibly, to obviate all Scandal even by approaching the Cup as neer their Mouths as they are able.* They have judged, by this regulation that both species were not, by the institution of *JESUS CHRIST*, essential to the Communion: otherwise they ought to have absolutely refused the Sacrament to those, who could not receive it whole and entire, and not to give it them after a manner contrary to that which *JESUS CHRIST* had commanded; in which case their disability would have been their excuse. But our Adversaries conceived it would be an excessive rigour, not to allow at least one of the species to those, who could not receive the other; and as this condescendence has no ground in Scripture, they must acknowledge with us, the words, by which *JESUS CHRIST* proposes to us the two species, are liable to some Interpretation, and that this Interpretation ought to be declared by the Authority of the Church.

But it might seem as if this Article of their Discipline, which was made in the Synod of *Poitiers* held in the year 1560, had been reformed by the Synod of *Vertueil* held in the year 1567. where it is said *the company is not of opinion, the Bread should be administred to those who would not receive the Cup.* These two Synods nevertheless are no ways opposite. That of *Vertueil* speaks only of those *who will not receive the Cup*; And that of *Poitiers* of those only *who cannot.* In effect, notwithstanding the Synod of *Vertueil*, this Article remains in their Discipline, and has been also approved by a latter Synod than that of *Vertueil*, by the Synod of *la Rochell* in 1571, where this Article was review'd, and put into that state in which it now is.

But supposing the Synods of the Pretended Reform'd Religion had differed in their Sentiments, it would only follow that the matter in question regards not Faith, and that it is of the number of those, which are at the Churches disposal according to their own Principles.

SECT. XVIII.

The written and unwritten Word.

THERE remains nothing more now, but to explicate what Catholics believe touching the Word of God, and the Authority of the Church.

JESUS CHRIST having laid the Foundation of his Church by Preaching, the unwritten Word was the first Rule of Christianity; and when the Writings of the *New Testament* were added, this unwritten Word did not upon that account lose its Authority: which makes us receive with equal veneration all that was ever taught by the Apostles, whether by Writing,

Writing, or by word of Mouth, as St. *Paul* himſelf has expreſly declared. And it is a moſt certain ſign, a Doctrine comes from the Apoſtles, when it is univerſally embraced by all Chriſtian Churches, without any poſſibility of ſhewing its beginning. We cannot chuſe but receive all that is eſtabliſhed after this manner, with the ſubmiſſion due to Divine Authority; and we are perſwaded thoſe of the Pretended Reformation, who are not obſtinate, are in the bottom of their Hearts of the ſame Opinion; it being impoſſible to believe a Doctrine, received from the beginning of the Church, can flow from any other ſource than that of the Apoſtles. Wherefore our Adverſaries ought not to wonder if we, who are careful to gather together all our Fathers have left us, ſhould conſerve the *Depoſitum* of Tradition as well as that of the Scriptures. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 14.

SECT. XIX.

The Authority of the Church.

THe Church being eſtabliſhed by God to be the Guardian of Scripture and Tradition, we receive the Canonical Scriptures from her; and let our Advetſaries ſay what they will, we doubt not but it is her Authority which principally determines them to reverence as Divine Books, the *Canticle of Canticles*, which has ſo few viſible marks of a Prophetical Inſpiration; the Epiſtle of St. *James*, which *Luther* rejected; and that of St. *Jude*, which might appear ſuſpected becauſe of ſome Apocryphal Books cited in it. In fine, it can only be from this Authority they receive the whole Body of Scripture, which all Chriſtians accept as Divine, before their reading of it has made them ſenſible of the Spirit of God in it.

Being then inſeparably bound, as we are, to the Holy Authority of the Church, by means of the Scriptures which we receive from her Hands, we learn Tradition alſo from her and by the means of Tradition we learn the true ſenſe of Scripture. Upon which account the Church profeſſes, ſhe tells us nothing from her ſelf, and that ſhe invents nothing new in her Doctrine: ſhe do's nothing but declare the Divine Revelation, by the Interior Direction of the Holy Ghoſt, who is given to her as her Teacher.

That Diſpute, which was raiſed in the very time of the Apoſtles, upon account of the Ceremonies of the Law, ſhews clearly, that the Holy Ghoſt, explicates himſelf by the Church; and their Acts have by the Method by which that firſt Conteſt was decided, taught all ſucceeding Ages, by what Authority all other Differences are to be ended. So that as often as there ſhall happen any Diſputes to cauſe a Diviſion amongſt the Faithful, the Church will interpoſe her Authority, and her Paſtors

Paſtors aſſembled will ſay after the Apoſtles, *It has ſeemed good to the Holy Ghoſt, and to us.* And when ſhe has ſpoken, her Children will be taught, they ought not to begin again to examine thoſe Articles once ſo reſolved on; but are bound humbly to receive her Deciſions. In this we ſhall follow the example of St. *Paul* and *Silas*, who carried this firſt Sentence of the Apoſtles to the Faithful, and were ſo far from permitting a new Diſcuſſion of what had been decided, that on the contrary, *They went from place to place, teaching them to obſerve the Ordinances of the Apoſtles.*

Acts. 15. 28.

Acts 16. 4.

Thus it is the Children of God acquieſce in the Judgment of the *Church*, believing that from her Mouth they hear the Oracle of the Holy Ghoſt; and upon account of this belief it is, that after having ſaid in our Creed, *I believe in the Holy Ghoſt*, we add immediately, *The Holy Catholic Church*; by which we oblige our ſelves to acknowledge an infallible and perpetual Verity in the Univerſal Church, becauſe this very Church which we believe exiſtent in all Ages, would ceaſe to be the Church, if ſhe ceaſed to teach the truth revealed by God. So that thoſe who apprehend leſt ſhe ſhould abuſe her Power to eſtabliſh a Lie, have no Faith in him by whom ſhe is governed.

And if our Adverſaries would but look upon theſe things in a more mild and candid manner, they would be obliged to acknowledge, the Catholic Church is ſo far from making her ſelf Miſtreſs of her Faith, as they have accuſed her, that, on the Contrary, ſhe has done what ſhe could to bind, and deprive her ſelf of all the Means of Innovation, ſeeing ſhe not only ſubmits her ſelf to the Holy Scriptures, but to the end ſhe might for ever baniſh all arbitrary Interpretations, which make Mens Imaginations paſs for Scripture, ſhe has obliged her ſelf to Interpret them, in what relates to Faith and Manners, according to the ſenſe of the Holy Fathers; from which ſhe profeſſeth never to depart, declaring in all her Councils, and (in all the Profeſſions of Faith ſhe has publiſhed) That ſhe do's not receive any Doctrine which is not conformable to the Tradition of all preceeding Ages.

Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 4.

Moreover, if our Adverſaries conſult their Conſciences, they will find the Name of the Church has more Authority over them, than they dare avouch in their Diſputes: And I do not think there is any one prudent Man amongſt them, who finding himſelf the only Perſon of a Perſwaſion, tho it appeared to him never ſo evident, but would abhor that Singularity; ſo true it is, that Men have need in theſe Matters to be ſupported in their Tenets, by the Authority of ſome Society that is of the ſame Opinion with them. And for this Reaſon, God, who created us, and who knows what is moſt proper for us, hath ordained for our good, that all Particulars ſhould be ſubject to the Authority of his Church, which, of all other Authorities, is without doubt the beſt eſtabliſhed. In effect, it is eſtabliſhed not only by that Teſtimony,

Teſtimony, which God himſelf gives of it in the Holy Scriptures, but alſo by the marks of his divine Protection, which are no leſs viſible in the inviolable and perpetual ſubſiſtence of it, than in its miraculous Eſtabliſhment.

SECT. XX.

The Sentiments of thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, concerning the Authority of the Church.

THis Supream Authority of the Church is ſo neceſſary to regulate the differences, which ariſe in matters of Faith, and about the Senſe of Scripture, that our Adverſaries themſelves, after having decried it, as an unſupportable Tyranny, have been at laſt obliged to eſtabliſh it amongſt themſelves.

When thoſe who are called *Independents*, declared openly, that each one of the Faithful ought to follow the light of his own Conſcience, without ſubmitting his Judgment to the Authority of any Body, or Eccleſiaſtical Aſſembly, and upon this ground refuſed to ſubmit to any Synods; That of *Charenton* held 1644. Cenſured this Doctrine upon the ſame Reaſons, and for the ſame Inconveniencies, for which we reject it. This Synod obſerves in the firſt place, that this Error of the *Independents* conſiſts in this, that they teach, *Every Church ought to be governed by her proper Laws, without a dependance upon any Perſon in Eccleſiaſtical Matters, and without any Obligation to acknowledge the Authority of Conferences and Synods for her regulation and conduct.* After which this Synod determines, that *this Sect is as prejudicial to the State as to the Church, that it opens a door to all ſorts of Irregularities and Extravagancies; that it takes away all the means of applying any remedy to it; and that if it took place, there might be as many Religions framed as Pariſhes or particular Aſſemblies.* Theſe laſt words ſhew it is Principally in matters of Faith, this Synod would eſtabliſh a *Dependance*; ſeeing the greateſt Inconvenience into which it obſerves the faithful would fall by an *Independence* is, *that there might chance to be as many Religions formed as Pariſhes.* Every Church then (according to the Doctrine of this Synod) and much more every private Perſon, muſt neceſſarily depend, in what concerns matters of Faith, upon ſome other ſuperior Authority, which reſides in ſome Aſſembly, or in ſome Body; to which Authority all the Faithful ſubmit their Judgments. For the *Independents* do not refuſe to ſubmit to the Word of God, according as they think it ought to be underſtood; nor to accept the Deciſions of Synods, when, after having examined them, they judge them reaſonable. What they refuſe to do, is to ſubmit their Judgments to that of any Aſſembly for its ſake; becauſe our Adverſaries have taught them, that every Aſſembly, even that of the Univerſal

Univerſal Church, is a Society of Men ſubject to Error, and to which, by conſequence, a Chriſtian ought not to ſubmit his Judgment; that ſubmiſſion being only due to God. From this pretenſion of the *Independents* it is, thoſe Inconveniencies follow, which the Synod of *Charenton* ſo well obſerved. For let a Man make what profeſſion he pleaſeth to ſubmit himſelf to the Word of God, if every one think he has a right to Interpret it according to his own Senſe, and againſt the Tenets of the Church declared in her laſt Sentence, this Pretenſion *will open a door to all ſorts of Extravagancies; it will take away all the means of applying a remedy*; becauſe the Deciſion of the Church is not a Remedy to thoſe, who think themſelves not obliged to ſubmit to it; in fine, it gives way to the *framing as many Religions*, not only *as there are Pariſhes*, but alſo as there are Perſons.

To avoid theſe Inconveniencies, from whence the ruine of Chriſtianity would follow, the Synod of *Charenton* finds her ſelf obliged to eſtabliſh *a Dependence in Eccleſiaſtical Matters*, and that even in Points of Faith; but this dependence will never hinder thoſe pernicious Conſequences which they deſired to prevent, if they do not, with us, eſtabliſh this Maxim, That every particular Church, and much more every particular Perſon amongſt the Faithful, ought to believe themſelves oblig'd to ſubmit their private Judgment to the Authority of the Church.

Thus we ſee in the Fifth Chapter of the Diſcipline, of the Pretended Reform'd Religion, under the Title of *Conſiſtories*, *Art* 31. that going about to preſcribe a Means to end *Debates*, *which might ariſe upon any Point of Doctrine or Diſcipline*, *&c.* they ordain firſt the Conſiſtory ſhall endeavour *to appeaſe the whole without noiſe*, *and with all the ſweetneſs of the Word of God*; and after having eſtabliſhed a Conſiſtory, a Conference, and a Provincial Synod, as ſo many different degrees of Juriſdiction, coming at laſt to a National Synod, above which, amongſt them, there is no Authority, they ſpeak of it in theſe terms. *There the entire and final Reſolution ſhall be given by the Word of God, to which if they refuſe to acquieſce in every Point, and with an expreſs diſavowing of their Errors, they ſhall be cut off from the Church.* It is manifeſt thoſe of the Pretended Reformation do not attribute the Authority of this laſt Sentence to the Word of God taken in it ſelf, and without dependence upon the Authority of the Church; for tho' this Word was made uſe of in their firſt Judgments, yet notwithſtanding they permitted an Appeal. It is then this Word as Interpreted by the Soveraign Tribunal of the Church, which gives *this final Reſolution, to which whoſoever refuſes to ſubmit in every Point*, altho' he boaſt he is Authorized by the Word of God, is no more reputed but as a Prophane Perſon who corrupts and abuſes it.

But the Form of thoſe Letters of Deputation which were addreſs'd to the Synod of *Vitré* in the year 1517, to be obſerved by the Provinces when they were to ſend their Deputies to a National Synod, has yet

yet ſomething more expreſs; it is in theſe terms. *We promiſe before God to ſubmit our ſelves to all that ſhall be concluded and reſolved of in your holy Aſſemblies, to obey them, and put them in execution to our utmoſt power, being perſwaded, as we are, that God will preſide in it, and lead you by his Holy Spirit into all Truth and Equity, by the Rule of his Word.* Here the Point is not about receiving the *Reſolution* of a Synod, after they have found it to ſpeak according to Scripture; they ſubmit to it there even before it is aſſembled; and they do it becauſe they are perſwaded *the Holy Ghoſt will preſide in it.* If this Perſuaſion be only founded upon a Human Preſumption, can a Man in Conſcience *promiſe before God to ſubmit to all that ſhall be there concluded and reſolved of, to obey, and execute them to the utmoſt of his power?* And if this Perſuaſion has its foundation in a certain belief of the Aſſiſtance which the Holy Ghoſt gives to the Church in her final Deciſions, Catholics themſelves require no more.

So that the Proceedings of our Adverſaries ſhew them to agree with us in this Supreme Authority, without which it is impoſſible ever to put an end to any Difficulty in Religion; and tho, whilſt they were deſirous to caſt off the yoak of Obedience, they denied the Faithful to be obliged to ſubmit their Judgments to that of the Church, yet the neceſſity of eſtabliſhing an Order, has ſince forced them to grant what their firſt Undertakings had made them deny.

They have gone yet much further in the National Synod held at St. *Foy* in the year 1578. There was ſome overture made of a Reconcilement with the *Lutherans*, by means of *a general Form of a Profeſſion of Faith common to all their Churches*, which was propoſed to be drawn up. Thoſe of this Kingdom were invited to ſend to an Aſſembly, which was to be held upon this account, *Vertuous Perſons, authoriſed by all the ſaid Churches, with an ample Procuration*, TO TREAT, AGREE UPON, AND DECIDE ALL POINTS OF DOCTRINE, *and other Matters concerning that Union.* Upon this Propoſal, ſee in what terms the Reſolution of the Synod of St. *Foy* was couched. *The National Synod of this Kingdom, after having given God thanks for ſuch an overture and commended the care, diligence, and good advice of the forementioned perſons convocated, and* APPROVING THE REMEDIES WHICH THEY HAVE SUGGESTED, that is to ſay, principally that of framing a new Confeſſion of Faith, and to give power to ſome certain Perſons to compoſe it, *has ordained, That if the Copy of the above named Confeſſion of Faith be ſent in time, it ſhall be examined in each Provincial Synod, or otherwiſe, according to the convenience of each Province; and in the mean time has deputed four Miniſters, the moſt experienced in thoſe Affairs, to whom expreſs charge has been given to be preſent at the place and day appointed, with the Letters and full Procurations of all the Miniſters, and Elders, Deputies of the Provinces of this Kingdom, as alſo of the Lord Viſcount* Turenne, *to do all things above ſaid: yea even, in the caſe that* MEANS COULD

NOT BE FOUND OUT TO EXAMINE IN EVERY PROVINCE THE SAID CONFESSION, *it ſhould be referred to their Prudence and ſound Judgment to agree and* CONCLUDE *all the points which ſhall be brought into deliberation, as well* FOR DOCTRINE, *as for other matters concerning the Benefit, Union, and Peace of all the Churches.* It was to this, in fine, that this ſeeming tenderneſs of Conſcience of theſe Pretended Reformers tended. How often have they reproched to us, as a weakneſs, that ſubmiſſion which we pay to the Deciſions of the Church, which, ſay they, is nothing elſe but a company of Men liable to Error? and yet nevertheleſs, being aſſembled in a Body in a National Synod, which repreſented all the Churches of the Pretended Reformed in *France*, they are not afraid, by mutual conſent, to leave their Faith to the Arbitration of four Men, with ſo abſolute an abandoning of their own Sentiments, that they gave them full power to change the very Confeſſion of Faith it ſelf, which they do at this very day propoſe to the whole Chriſtian World as a Confeſſion of Faith, which containeth nothing but the pure Word of God, and for which, as they ſaid in preſenting it to our Kings, an infinite number of People were ready to ſhed their Blood. I leave the prudent Reader to make his reflections upon the Decree of this Synod; and ſhall in a few words finiſh the Explication of the Churches Tenets.

SECT. XXI.

The Authority of the Holy See of Rome, *and of* Epiſcopacy.

THE Son of God, being deſirous his Church ſhould be one, and ſolidly built upon Unity, hath eſtabliſhed and inſtituted the Primacy of St. *Peter* to maintain and cement it. Upon which account, we acknowledg this Primacy in the *Succeſſors* of the Prince of the Apoſtles, to whom, for this cauſe, we owe that Obedience and Submiſſion, which the Holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful.

As for thoſe things, which we know are diſputed of in the Schools, tho' the Miniſters continually alledge them to render this Power odious, it is not neceſſary we ſpeak of them here, ſeeing they are not Articles of the Catholic Faith. It is ſufficient we acknowledg a Head eſtabliſhed by God to conduct his whole flock in his Paths; which thoſe who love Concord amongſt Brethren, and Eccleſiaſtical Unanimity, will moſt willingly acknowledg.

And certainly if the Authors of the Pretended Reformation had loved Unity, they would neither have aboliſhed Epiſcopal Government, which was eſtabliſhed by *JESUS CHRIST* himſelf, and which we find in force even in the times of the Apoſtles; nor have deſpiſed the Authority of St. *Peter's*

St. *Peter*'s Chair, which has ſo ſolid a Foundation in the Goſpel, and ſo evident a ſucceſſion in Tradition; but they would rather have carefully conſerved Epiſcopal Authority, which eſtabliſheth unity in particular Churches, and the Primacy of St. *Peter*'s Chair, which is the common Center of all Catholic Unity.

SECT. XXII.

Concluſion of this Treatiſe.

THis is the Expoſition of the Catholic Doctrine, in which, that I might tye my ſelf to the moſt Principal, I have left ſome queſtions untouched, which thoſe of the Pretended Reform'd Religion do not look upon as lawful matter for a Separation. I hope thoſe of their Communion, who ſhall impartially examine all the parts of this Treatiſe, will be better diſpoſed by the reading of it, to give ear to thoſe proofs upon which the Faith of the Church is eſtabliſhed, and will in the mean time acknowledg many of our Controverſies may be ended by a ſincere explication of our Tenets; that her Doctrine is Holy, and that, according to their own Principles, no one of her Articles deſtroys the grounds of Salvation.

If any one ſhould think fit to anſwer this *Treatiſe*, he is deſired to conſider, that to accompliſh his intent, he muſt not undertake to refute the Doctrine contained in it, ſeeing my Deſign was only to propoſe it, without going about to prove it; and that if in ſome Places I have hinted at ſome of the reaſons which eſtabliſh it, it is becauſe the knowledg of the Principal reaſons of a Doctrine, is often a neceſſary part of it's Explication.

It would alſo be a quitting of the deſign of this Treatiſe, to examine the different methods, which Catholic Divines make uſe of to eſtabliſh or explicate the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and the different Conſequences, which particular Doctors have drawn from it. To urge any thing ſolid againſt this Treatiſe, and which may come home to the Point; it muſt be proved that the Churches Faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by acts which the ſame Church has obliged her ſelf to receive; or elſe it muſt be ſhown, that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the Diſputes untouched; or in fine, it muſt be preciſely ſhown in what this Doctrine ſubverts the Foundations of Faith.

Letters and *Approbations* mentioned in the *Advertisement*.

A Letter of his Eminence to the Card. BONA of happy Memory, to his Eminence the Card. de BUILLON.

HO ricevuto il libro di Monsignor Vescovo di Condom, che V. E. si è degnata inviarmi, e sì come Conosco la qualità del favore, e mene pregio, così rendo alla sua gentilezza infinite gratie e per il dono e per il pensiero che si prende di accrescere la mia Libraria. L'hò letto con attentione particolare, e perche V. E. mi accenna che alcuni lo accusano di qualche mancamento, hò voluto particolarmente osservare in che potesse esser ripreso. Mà realmente non sò trovarci se non materia di grandissima lode, perche senza entrare nelle questioni spinose delle controversie, con una maniera ingegnosa, facile, e famigliare, e con metodo, per così dire, geometrica da certi principii communi & approvati convince i Calvenisti, e li necessita á confessare la verità della Fede Cattolica. Assicuro V. E. di haver lo letto con mia indicibile sodisfattione; nè mi maraviglio che gli habbino trovato á dire, perche tutte le Opere grandi, e che sormontano l' ordinario, sempre hanno contradittori. Vince però finalmente la verità, e da' frutti si connosce la qualità dell'albero. Me ne rallegro con l' Autore, il quale hà dato saggio del suo gran talento con questa opera, e potrà con molte altre servire lodevolmente à Santa Chiesa. Roma 19. Gennaro 1672.

A Letter from his Eminence the Cardinal SIGISMOND CHIGI, of happy Memory, to the Abbot of *Dangeau*.

RICEVEL con la sua lettera ill Libro della Espositione della Dottrina Cattolica del Vescovo di Condom, molto eruditore molto utile per convetire gl' heritici più con le vive ragioni, che con l'asprezza del discorso. Parlai al Padre, Mastro di S. Palazzo, & al Segretario del Congregatione dell Indice, e conobbi veramente, che non viera stato chi havesse a questi Padri parlato in disfavore del medesimo. Anzi li trovai pirni di estimatione per il medesimo: & havendo poi parlato conquesti Signori Cardinali della Congregatione, trovai frà gl'altri il Signor Cardinale Brancaccio molto inclinato a pregiarlo, e molto propensa a lodarne l' Autore. Onde io tengo certo che qua ancora Monsignor di Condom ottenga quella lode, che e dovuta alla sua fatica & alla sua dottrina. Resto per tanto obligato alla sua gentilezza che mi ha dato modo di ammirar la medisima; mentre mi pare che l' Autore stringa bene i suoi argomenti, e mostri chiaro i punti noi quali i divisi discordano della Chieza; ne credo che ill modo che tien l' Autore, sia da condannarsi nell' esplicatione di qualche Dottrina insegnata dal Concilio di Trento, essendo praticato da molti Scrittori & essendo da lui maneggiato molto regolatamente; in oltre che l' Autore non ha havuto in mente d'interpretare i dogmi di quel Concilio; ma solo importarli nel suo libro esplicati perche gl'heritici restino convinti, & in chiaro di tutto quello che la Santa Chiesa gl'obliga di credere. Dell'autorita del Papa, ne parlabene, e con il dovuto rispetto della Sede Romana ogni voltà che parla del capo visibile della Chiesa; onde torno a dire che non capace che di lode. Roma 5. Apr. 1672.

A Letter

A Letter from the Rev. Father HYACINTHUS LIBELLI, at that time Master of the Sacred Palace, and now A. B. of *Avignon*, to the Card. *SIGISMOND CHIGI.*

HO letto ill Libre del Sig. di Condom continente l' Esposition della Dottrina della Chiesa. Devo infinite gratie à V. E. che mi habbia fatto consumare, quattro hore di tempo sì virtuosamente, e con tanto mio diletto. Mi è piacciuto sopra modo, e per l' Argomento singolare, e per le prove, che à quello corrispondono La Dottrina è tutta sana ne v'ha ombra di mancamento. Ne per me sò quello che possa opporvisi; e se l' Autore desidererà che si ristampi in Roma, da me otterrà totte le facoltà che gli saranno necessarie ad effetto che si ristampi senza mutarne ne pure una parola. L' Autore che ha molto ingegno si è servito in questa operetta del giuditio, perche laciate da parte le dispute, che sogliono quæsi sempre accrescer le discordie, trovandosi di raro chi voglia cedere le prerogative del ingegno al compagno, hà trovato un altro modo più facile di trattar co' Calvinisti dal quale puo sperarsi maggior frutto. Perche ogni volta che perdin quel errore à nostri dogmi che hanno succhiato col latte, à noi più volentieri s'accostano, e posta in malafede la dottrina che hanno appresa da loro Mastri di cui la massima principale e essere i nostri dogmi orrendi & incredili, si pongono con minor passion d'animo à cercar la verità Cattolica, che à quello a che devono esortarsi acciocche rineghino gli errori, perche, come V. E. discorreva l'atro giorno, la verità Cattolica vince appresso ogn'huomo prudente riconosciuta à petto dell' Eresia ogni volta che sia esaminata senza preoccupatione di spirito. Hò preso ardire di fare à V. E. questa lunga deceria per una sfogo del contento ch' ho'havuto di legere il sudetto libro, che Ella hà fatto gratia di participarmi, e pregandola a continuarmi simili favori le bacio riverentemente le vesti. Roma, 26 Aprile 1672.

A Letter from the Bishop and Prince of *PADERBORNE* at that time Coadjutor, and now Bishop of *Munster*, to the Author.

QUanquam ad virtutem ac eruditionem tuam toti terrarum orbi omnique posteritati commendandam sufficiat judicium Regis Christianissimi, qui filium suum in spem tantæ fortunæ genitum tibi instituendum erudiendumque commisit: tu tamen immortali proprii ingenii monumento, aureo videlicet illo libello, cui titulus est, Expositio Doctrinæ Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, *nomen tuum pariterque Christianam disciplinam magis illustrare; voluisti eoque non solum ab omnibus Catholicis maximos plausus tulisti, sed etiam ex ipsis hæterodoxis verissimas ingenii atque doctrinæ tuæ laudes expressisti. Elucet enim in admirabili illo opusculo incredibilis quædam res difficiles & planè cælestes atque divinas explicandi facilitas, & gratissimus candor, ac veré Christiana Charitas atque Benignitas, qua sedentes in tenebris & umbra mortis tam suaviter allicis, & illuminas, ac dirigis in viam pacis, ut unus Episcoporum ad hostes Catholicæ fidei sub jugum suavæ veritatis mittendos fictus & factus esse videaris. Quapropter ut eximii operis fructus longiùs manaret, atque per Universam Germaniam, aliasque gentes sese diffunderet libellum tuum in latinum sermonem convertendi impetum cepi; sed ubi literas tuas VIII. Cal. Maii datas perlegi, dubitavi sane ut rum progredi oporteret, an incepto absistere, quia te non solum Gallici, sed etiam Latini sermonis nitore ac elegantiâ tantopere pollere perspexi, ut quicunque præter temetipsum tua scripta de Gallico verteret, is pulcherrimum in genii tui partum deformaturus potius, quàm ornaturus*

turus esse videretur. Quarè tu potissimùm esses Orandus, ut fœtum, quem in lucem edidisti latinitate donares. Sed quia forsitan id tibi per occupationes non licet, & si quidem tantum tibi sit otii, obsecrandus es potiùs, ut plura scribas, quàm ut scripta convertas; faciam id quod tibi pergratum esse significas, & illum cui hanc provinciam dedi urgebo, ut inchoata perficiat; tibique versionem libelli tui censendam corrigendamque transmittam. Te verò, Præsul Illustrissime longéque doctissime, maximopere semper observabo & amicitiam tuam ad quam hic meus conatus & tua benignitas aditum mihi patefecit, omni officio colere studebo. Vale, Antistes eximie, ac de Republicâ Christianâ optimè merite, & me, ut facias, ama, atque Serenissimo Delphino cum optimis artibus atque præceptis nostram quoque memoriam & amorem instilla, & Ducem Montauserium meis verbis jube salvere plurimùm. In Arce meâ ad Confluentes Luppiæ, Paderæ & Alisonis, 3. Kal. Jun. 1673.

A Letter from the Rev. Father *RAIMUNDUS CAPISUCCHI*, Master of the Sacred Palace, to the Author.

IL merito sublime di V. S. Ill da me ammirato, doveva esse ranche servito nell' occasione dell dottissimo, & eruditissimo libro da lei composto in difesa della Fede Cattolica, & tradotto per beneficio di tutti anche nella Lingua Italiana, onde io devo render singolarissime gratie, come faccio à V. S. Ill dell' occasione, che mi hà dato di servirla. Stiamo tutti attendo la publicatione di questo bellissimo libro, per godere delle sue nobilissime fatiche, & io in particolare che vivo, e vivero sempre ambitioso di altri suoi commandamenti, e qui per fine con ogni ossequio la riverisco. Roma 20. Guign. 1675.

The Approbations of the Roman Edition Ann. 1678.

The Approbation of Signior *MICHEL ANGELO RICCI*, Secretary to the Congregation of *I.* and *H. R.* and Consultor of the Holy Office.

QUOD Tridentina Synodus magno studio assecuta est, ut doctrinam Fidei ab opinionibus, & controversiis inter Catholicos omninò secerneret, ac eandem apertiùs, & significantiùs explicaret; ac Tertullianus olim, ut Hæreticorum secessionem ab Ecclesia certus præscriptionibus improbaret; alii, ut principia quædam Hæreticorum, & regulas, ad refutationem ipsorum ingeniosè contorquerent: ea Clarissimus quoque Vir Jacobus Benignus Bossuet, Condomi Episcopus, præstitit in hoc Opere, perspicua methodo, brevi, & ad persuadendum accommodata, quæ quidem præclarum Auctoris ingenium refert. Quod Opus Italorum commoditati nunc eleganter versum è Gallica in maternam linguam prælo, ac luce dignum existimo. Romæ die 5. Augusti 1678. *MICHAEL ANGELUS RICCIUS.*

The Approbation of the Reverend Father *LAURENCE BRANCATI DE LAUREA* of the Congregat. of Consist. I. Rites; Visit. Consultor and Qualificator of the Holy Office, and Bibliothecarian of the Vatican Library, *&c.*

LUCE dignum existimo Opusculum, seu discursum Gallicè & variis linguis impressum, nunc autem ex Gallico in Italicum idioma conversum, in quo Illustrissimus Dominus Jacobus Benignus Bossuet Episcopus & Toparcha Condomi, nobili, sed gravi ac solido stylo Religionis Prætensæ Reformatæ Ministros, & Assecias, tam communibus

communibus Ecclesiæ fundamentalibus regulis, quàm propriis eorumdem principiis fortiter perstringit, ostendens, non Catholicos, ut ii Ministri autumant, sed ipsosmet Ministros, per impropriàs consequentias recessisse ab Ecclesiæ dogmatibus, nobis, ipsisque communibus; & expravis ejusmodi Scripturæ vel Conciliorum intelligentiis, Catholicam communionem reliquisse. Et si ipsi Ministri Catholicorum Regulas in Conciliis, præsertim in Tridentino fundatas, absque passione scrutarentur, proculdubio, ex Dei auxilio, ad sanctam redirent unitatem; & discurrens per singulas controversias suaviter, sed palmariè id exequitur. Datum in Conventu Sanctorum XII. Apostolorum. Romæ die 25. Julii 1671.

F. LAURENTIUS DE LAUREA MIN. CONVENTUALIS.

The Approbation of the Abbot *Stephen Gradi:*

LEGI diligenter, & studiosè egregium summi Viri Jacobi Benigni Condomensis Antistitis Opus, in sermonem Italicum fideliter eleganterque conversum, quo Doctrina Ecclesiæ breviter, enucleatè, luculenter exponitur. Indeque sic affectus animo discessi, ut legentes optima quæque, atque à sana, doctrina, & summa ratione optimè parata, solent discedere, ut non alia se dicturos, nec aliter locuturos, si ad scribendum de talibus se contulissent, existiment. Super omnia verò me cepit Scriptoris, ut ita dicam, sobrietas in delectu rerum, quas promit, dum circumcisis, quæ lites extendere, & meliori causæ invidiam conflare nata sunt, ipsam veritatis arcem capessit, tutamque, & inaccessam præstat; totus in rectè constituendo controversiæ statu, quam ea re dijudicatu facilem, & expeditam efficit. Hunc itaque librum, si me audient, quibus concordi Ecclesia Christiana, & salva sua ipsorum anima opus est, diurna nocturnaque manu versare non desinent; neque non fieri potest ne eos diversa à Fide orthodoxa sentire non pigeat, pudeatque.

Ita sentio ego STEPHANUS GRADIUS S. Congr. Indicis Consultor. & Biblioth. Vatic. Præf.

Imprimatur si videbitur Reverendiss. P. S, P. Apost. Magistro. J. DE ANGELIS, Archiep. Urb. Vicesger.

Imprimatur. F. RAIMUNDUS CAPISUCCUS, Ord. Præd. S. P. A. Magister.

The Brief of our Holy Father Pope *Innocent* the XI.

VEnerabilis Frater, salutem & Apostolicam benedictionem. Libellus de Catholicæ Fidei Expositione à fraternitate tuâ compositus, nobisque oblatus, ea doctrina eaque methodo ac prudentia scriptus est, ut perspicua brevitate legentes doceat, & extorquere possit, etiam ab invitis, Catholicæ veritatis confessionem. Itaque non solùm à nobis commendari, se ab omnibus legi, atque in pretio haberi meretur. Ex eo sanè non mediocres in orthodoxæ Fidei propagationem, quæ nos præcipuè curæ intentos ac solicitos, habet, utilitates redundaturas, Deo bene juvante, confidimus: ac vetus interim nostra de tua virtute ac pietate opinio comprobatur, magno cum incremento spei jampridem susceptæ fore ut institutioni tuæ creditus, eximia, hoc est paterna, avitaque præditus indole DELPHINUS, *eam à te hauriat disciplinam, qua maximè informatum esse decet Christianissimi Regis filium, in quem unà cum florentissimo regno, Catholicæ Religionis defensio perventura est: Idque perenni cum Regis ipsius decore, qui Fraternitatem tuam inter tot egregios viros, quibus Gallia abundat, ad opus potissimùm elegit, in quo publicæ fœlicitatis fundamenta jacerentur; cùm divino doceamur Oraculo, patris gloriam esse filium sapientem. Tu perge alacriter in incepto, ad quod incitare te, præter alia, magnopere debet, qui*

jam

jam apparet laborum, atque induſtriæ tuæ fructus. Audimus enim & quidem ex omnium ſermone, ac magno cum animi noſtri ſolatio inter tot prementia mala audimus, DELPHINUM ipſum magno ad omnem virtutem impetu ferri, & paria pietatis atque ingenii documenta præbere; Illud tibi pro certo affirmamus, nullâ in re devincire te arctiùs poſſe paternam noſtram erga te voluntatem, quàm in regio adoleſcente bonis omnibus, & Rege maximo dignis artibus imbuendo, ut is adultæ poſteà ætate, Barbaras gentes & Chriſtiani nominis inimicas, quas Parentem inclytum reddita Europæ pace; & tranſlatis in Orientem invictis armis Imperio latè ſuo adjecturum ſperamus, victor & ipſe ſanctiſſimis legibus, moribuſque componat. Devotionem interim atque obſervantiam quam erga ſanctam hanc Sedem, noſque ipſos, quia in ea Catholicæ Eccleſiæ immerito præſidemus, tuæ ad nos literæ luculenter declarant, mutuæ charitatis affectu complectimur, cujus profectò in occaſionibus quæ ſe dederint Fraternitati tuæ argumenta non deerunt, tibique Apoſtolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimur. Datum Romæ, apud S. Petrum ſub annulo Piſcatoris, die 4. Januarii 1679. Pontificatus noſtri anno 3. MARIUS SPINULA. And on the out-ſide, *Venerabili Fratri Jacobo, Epiſcopo Condomenſi.*

The *foregoing* Teſtimonies rendred *Engliſh.*

A Letter from his Eminence the Cardinal BONA *of happy Memory, to his Eminence the Cardinal* de BUILLON.

I Have receiv'd the *R. Biſhop of Condom*'s Book, which your Eminence did me the Honor to ſend me; and as I am ſenſible of the Quality of this Favour, and eſteem my ſelf much honored by it; ſo I render you my moſt cordial thanks, as well for the Preſent, as for the care you take to encreaſe my Library. I have read it with a particular attention; and becauſe your E. tells me, there are ſome who accuſe it of ſome failings, I endeavour'd expreſly to obſerve in what it might be worthy of reprehenſion. But really I could not find any thing in it, but matter of great Commendation; ſeeing, without entring into the more difficult Queſtions in Controverſie, he makes uſe of a moſt ingenious, eaſie, and familiar manner, and of a Method, as I may ſay, Geometrical, to convince the *Calviniſts* by common and approved Principles, and to force them to confeſs the Catholic Faith.

I can aſſure your E. I found, in reading it, a Satisfaction which I cannot expreſs; and I am not aſtoniſhed that ſome have found fault with it; for all Works great, and above the common level, find Perſons ſtill to contradict them. But Truth prevails in the End, and the quality of the Tree is known by the Fruit. I congratulate with the Author, who has by this Work given us an Eſſay of his great Talents, and may by many others render conſiderable Service to the Church. *Rome, Jan.* 19. 1672.

A Letter from Cardinal SIGISMOND CHIGI, *of happy Memory, to the Abbot of* DANGEAU.

I Have received, together with your Letter, the Expoſition of the Catholic Doctrine, compos'd by the Biſhop of *Condom*. I have found it full of Erudition, and ſo much the more proper to Convert Heretics, as it preſſes them with lively Reaſons, without any Bitterneſs. I made mention of it to the Reverend Father, Maſter of the Sacred Palace, and to the Secretary of the Congregation *dell' Indice*: I underſtood that no body had ſpoken againſt it to theſe Fathers, who ſeemed to me, on the contrary, full of Eſteem for this Work. I diſcourſed of it likewiſe to the Cardinals of the Congregation, and amongſt all the reſt, I found Cardinal *Brancas* much enclined to praiſe the Author, and eſteem the Book. So that I doubt not but *M. de Condom* will receive here the ſame approbation, which has been given him every where elſe, and which is ſo legitimately due both to his Learning, and his Labour. I am very much obliged to you for having given me the means of admiring him, and have perceived in this, your old and ordinary goodneſs. The Author is cloſe in his Proofs, and explicates very clearly the Subject he treats on, in ſhewing the true difference betwixt the belief of Catholics, and that of the Enemies of the Church. I do not think the Method he takes to explicate the Doctrine taught in the Council of *Trent*, can in the leaſt be diſapprov'd; this Method having been practiſed by many other Writers, and being handled throughout his whole Book, with great Exactneſs. Certainly it was never his Intention to give the Interpretation of the Tenets of the Council, but only to deliver them in his Book, rightly explicated, in ſuch ſort that Heretics may be convinc'd, and eſpecially in thoſe things which the Holy Church obliges them to believe. He ſpeaks perfectly well of the Popes Authority, and whereever he treats of the viſible Head of the Church, he appears full of reſpect for the Holy See. In fine, I muſt tell you once again, *M. de Condom* cannot be too much commended, *&c. Rome, April* 5. 1672.

A Letter from the Reverend Father HYACINTHUS LIBELLI, *at that time Maſter of the Sacred Palace, and now Archbiſhop of* Avignon, *to the Cardinal* SIGISMOND CHIGI.

I Have read *M. de Condom*'s Book, which contains an Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Church. I am extreamly indebted to your Eminence for giving me the opportunity of employing four hours ſo profitably, and with ſo much Pleaſure. It is impoſſible for me to expreſs how much this Work has pleaſed me, both for the peculiar Excellence of the Deſign, and for the Proofs which correſpond to it. The Doctrine is ſound in all its parts; and without the ſmalleſt ſhadow of a fault. As for my ſelf, I cannot ſee what can be objected againſt it; and if the

Author would have the Book Printed at *Rome*, I will give all the neceſſary Approbations, without changing a ſingle Word. This Author, who has a great deal of Wit, has ſhown a great deal of Judgment too in this Treatiſe, where, laying aſide Diſputes, which ordinarily ſpeaking do but encreaſe Diſſentions, it being rare to find any who will grant the Preheminence of Wit to their Companions, he has found out another, and more eaſie Method of treating with the *Calviniſts*, from which much better Fruit may be expected. In effect, as ſoon as they can be brought to lay aſide that horror which they have ſucked in with their Milk, againſt our Tenets, they come more willingly towards us, and diſcovering the inſincerity of that Doctrine which they Learn'd from their Maſters, the Principal Maxim of which is, That our Doctrines are horrid and incredible, they apply themſelves, with more tranquility of Mind, to ſearch into Catholic Verities.

This is what they muſt be carefully exhorted to, ſince there is no better Method to make them renounce their Errors; and your Eminence had great reaſon when you lately ſaid, That Catholic Truth will always be victorious in the Mind of every man of Senſe, who will only without prejudice conſider it in Compariſon with Hereſie. I take the Liberty to write this long Diſcourſe to your Eminence, not being able to contain within my ſelf the Pleaſure, which the Reading of this Book, you have been pleaſed to let me have, has afforded me. I beg your Eminence will continue the like Favours to me, &c. *Rome*, 26 *April*, 1672.

A Letter from the Biſhop and Prince of PADERBORNE, *at that time Coadjutor, and now Biſhop of* Munſter, *to the Author.*

THe moſt Chriſtian King, when he entruſted to you the Inſtruction and Education of his Son, born to ſo much Greatneſs, did by his Judgement alone ſufficiently recommend your Knowledg, and your Merit to all the World, and all Poſterity: Yet you have given a new Luſtre to your Reputation, and to the Chriſtian Doctrine, by an immortal Monument of your Worth; I would ſay, by that moſt Excellent Book, whoſe Title is, *An Expoſition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church*, which has not only gained the vaſt applauſe of Catholics, but forced the Heretics themſelves to give deſerved Praiſes to your Judgement, and Erudition. In this moſt admirable Treatiſe, there appears a moſt incredible facility to unfold the moſt difficult, the moſt ſublime, and moſt Divine things; and at the ſame time a moſt winning Candor, and a truly Chriſtian Charity, and Bounty, capable to draw with ſweetneſs all thoſe who are ſet in Darkneſs, and in the ſhadow of Death, and to enlighten, and conduct them into the way of Peace: Inſomuch that you ſeem to be choſen amongſt the Biſhops, to reduce the Enemies of Catholic Faith under the eaſie Yoak of Truth. To the end therefore

therefore the effects of this great work might be the more extended, and might ſpead it ſelf throughout all *Germany*, and amongſt other Nations, I had formed to my ſelf a deſign of having it put into *Latin*; but after having read your Letter of the 24*th.* of *April*, I had a doubt whether I ought to proceed any farther in it, or quit my deſign, becauſe I perceived you were as perfect a Maſter of the *Latin* Tongue, as of the *French*; and that you writ it with ſo much Purity, that if any other ſhould undertake to tranſlate your Works, inſtead of adorning thoſe curious Products of your Wit, he might on the Contrary diſcredit them. You ought the rather therefore to be deſired to put what you have publiſhed your ſelf in *Latin*. But ſeeing that perhaps you have not leiſure, and, if you had, it would be much better you ſhould be employed in the Compoſition of more new Works, than in the Tranſlation of thoſe you have already Compoſed; becauſe you admit of it, I will haſten him, to whom I have committed it, to finiſh what he has begun; and will ſend you the Verſion of your own Book, that you may review and Correct it your ſelf. What remains for me, is always infinitely to Honor your Vertue and Learning, and to make it my endeavour to cultivate that Friendſhip, which my care of the Verſion, and your Bounty have given ſo favourable a beginning to. Continue ſtill to love me, moſt worthy Prelate, who ſerve the Church ſo well, and while you give the *Dauphin* ſo many excellent inſtructions, contrive for me a place in the remembrance and affection of ſo great a Prince. Give, if you pleaſe, my moſt humble Service to the Duke *de Montauſier*. In my Caſtle, at the Confluence of the *Lippe*, the *Padere*, and the *Aliſe*, the 29*th.* of *May*, 1673.

A Letter from the Reverend Father RAIMUNDUS CAPISUCCHI, *Maſter of the Sacred Palace, to the Author.*

AFter having admired with all others ſo ſublime a deſert as yours; I muſt alſo ſhew the particular Inclination I have to ſerve you, occaſioned by that excellent and learned Work you have Compoſed for the defence of the Catholic Faith, and which has been lately Tranſlated into *Italian*, for its farther ſpreading. I am indebted to you an infinite acknowledgment for having afforded me an occaſion of rendring you ſome Service; we are all of us here in great expectation of the Publiſhing of this excellent piece, that we may enjoy the Fruits of your Labours. No body will have a greater ſatisfaction than my ſelf, who do, and ſhall always feel an ardent deſire to render my ſelf worthy of the Honor of your Commands. I end with aſſuring you of my reſpects. *Rome*, 20 *June*, 1675.

The Approbations of the *Roman* Edition, *Anno* 1678.

The Approbation of Signor MICHEL ANGELO RICCI, *Secretary to the Congregation of* I. *and* H. R. *and Conſultor of the Holy Office.*

WHat the Council of *Trent* has with great care performed, in making an entire ſeparation betwixt Articles of Faith, Opinions, and Diſputes of the Schools; and explicating the ſame Doctrines of Faith in more clear and ſignificant Terms; what *Tertullian* had formerly done, in condemning the departure of Heretics from the Church by ſeveral Preſcriptions; what others have practiſed, whilſt they ingenuouſly combated Heretics by their own Principles and Rules; the ſame has the Right Reverend *James Benign Boſſuet* Biſhop of *Condom* performed in this Work, in a clear and ſhort Method, proper to perſwade; manifeſting to us the admirable parts of the Author. Which work being now for the convenience of the *Italians*, elegantly Tranſlated out of *French*, into our Mother Language, I eſteem worthy to be Printed and Publiſhed. *Rome. Auguſt the* 5*th.* 1678.

The Approbation of the Reverend Father LAURENCE BRANCATI de LAUREA, *of the Congregation of Conſiſt. I. Rites; Viſit. Conſultor and Qualificator of the Holy Office, and Bibliothecarian of the* Vatican *Library*, &c.

I Eſteem moſt worthy its being publiſhed the little Treatiſe or Diſcourſe, Printed in *French* and ſeveral other Languages, and at preſent Tranſlated out of *French* into *Italian*, in which the moſt Illuſtrious *James Benign Boſſuet* Biſhop and Lord of *Condom* does forceably combat in a Noble, Grave, and Solid Stile, the Miniſters of the Pretended Reform'd Religion and their followers, as well by the common and fundamental Rules of the Church, as by their own Principles; ſhowing, that it is not Catholics, as thoſe Miniſters imagine, but the Miniſters themſelves, who by drawing unnatural Conſequences, have receeded from thoſe Tenets which are Common to them and us, and by taking the Scriptures and Councils in a wrong Senſe, have ſeparated themſelves from the Catholic Church. But if they would examin without Paſſion the Rules of Catholics grounded upon their Councils, and eſpecially upon that of *Trent*, they would without doubt, by the Grace of God, return again to a Holy Unity: All which this Author ſhows them in a moſt pleaſing, and no leſs convincing manner, running through all the points of Controverſie. Given in the *Convent* of the Twelve Apoſtles at *Rome*, the 25. *July*, 1678.

F. Laurentius de Laurea, Min. Conventualis.

The

The Approbation of the Abbot Stephen Gradi.

I Have with diligence and application Read the excellent Work of the Lord *James Benign Boſſuet*, Biſhop of *Condom*, faithfully and elegantly Tranſlated into *Italian*, where the Doctrine of the Church is explicated after a manner both conciſe, clear, and full. And it wrought the ſame Impreſſion in me, which ordinarily thoſe nobler ſort of Writings, which are the Products of a ſound Doctrine and ſolid Reaſon, do in their Readers, when they are convinc'd they could not have ſaid any thing more to the purpoſe, nor ſpoken otherwiſe, if they had undertaken to write of the ſame Subject. But what Tranſported me the moſt was that Wiſdom and Moderation of the Author in the choice of thoſe things which he aſſerts; he retrenches all thoſe things which ſerve only to lengthen Diſputes, and render a good Cauſe odious, and betakes himſelf to Truth alone, as to a ſtrong hold, which he renders not only ſecure but inacceſſable: Applying himſelf wholly to eſtabliſh the true ſtate of the Queſtion, which by that means is rendred clear and eaſie to be judged of. Upon which account, all thoſe, if they will believe me, who are concerned for the Peace of the Church, or the Salvation of their Souls, ought day and night to turn over this Book; and it is impoſſible, but it ſhould produce in them both ſhame and ſorrow, for holding Tenets, contrary to the Orthodox Faith.

I am of this Opinion,

St. G. Conſultor of the *Congregation de L' Indice*, *Prefect* of the *Vatican Library.*

Let it be Printed, if it ſo pleaſe the very Reverend Father, Maſter of the Sacred Apoſtolic Palace. *J. de Angelis Archiep. Urb. Viceſger.*

Let it be Printed,

F. Raimundus Capiſuccus Ord. Præd. S. P. A. Magiſter.

The

The Brief of our Holy Father

POPE *INNOCENT* XI.

VEnerable Brother, Health and Apoſtolical Benediction. Your Book of the *Expoſition of the Catholic Faith*, lately preſented to Us, contains ſuch Doctrine, and is compoſed in ſuch a Method, and with ſo much Prudence, that it is thereby rendred proper to inſtruct the Readers clearly in few Words, and to extort, even from the unwilling, a Confeſſion of the Catholic Faith. For which Reaſons We do not only think it worthy Our Commendation, but alſo to be read and eſteem'd by all. We hope, this Work, by the Grace of God, will bring forth much Fruit, and will not a little help to propagate the Orthodox Faith, which is Our continual Care, and principal Solicitude. And in the interim, We are more and more confirm'd in that good Opinion we have always had of your Vertue and Piety, and We feel an Increaſe of thoſe Hopes which We had long ſince formed in Our Selves, of the Education of the *Dauphin* of *France*, and that He who is intruſted to your Care, and endowed with Inclinations worthy the King His Father, and all His Anceſtors, will receive from you thoſe Inſtructions which are proper to the Son of a Moſt Chriſtian King, whoſe Birth entitles him both to ſo Flouriſhing a Kingdom, and at the ſame time to be a Protector of the Catholic Religion. And this King, who has choſen you amongſt ſo many Great Men, with which *France* flouriſhes at this time, to ſo great a Province, as is the laying the Foundations of a Public Happineſs, will no doubt receive an Eternal Glory from the good Succeſs of your Care, according to that Oracle of Scripture which tells us, *That a wiſe Son is the Glory of his Father.* Continue

nue then to go forwards chearfully in ſo important a Work, eſpecially ſince you have before your Eyes ſuch mighty Fruits of your Induſtry. For We hear, and that from all Parts, and We cannot but feel an Exceſs of Joy and Conſolation, amidſt Our many Troubles, when We hear, how this young Prince is carried on to Vertue with a Noble Fervour, and daily gives new Teſtimonies of Prudence and of Piety. This We can aſſure you, That nothing is capable of endearing Our Paternal Affection to you more, than thus to employ your utmoſt Care to inſpire into this young Prince's Mind thoſe Maxims which make a mighty King; that in a riper Age, being Happy and Victorious like the King his Father, he may regulate by Holy Laws, and reduce to Chriſtian Manners, Barbarous Nations, and Enemies of the Name of *Chriſtian*, as We hope to ſee them ſhortly ſubdu'd to the Empire of this Great King, ſince Peace being reſtored to *Europe*, he has ſo fair an Opportunity to transfer his Victorious Arms into the *Eaſt*. To conclude, Aſſure your ſelf, the Submiſſion and Reſpect which your Letters ſhow you to have towards the Apoſtolic See, and Us, who now poſſeſs it, tho' unworthy, for the Government of the Catholic Church, find in Us a mutual Affection; the Teſtimonies of which, you ſhall perceive, when any Occaſion ſhall preſent it ſelf. With a ſincere Affection We give you Our Apoſtolic Benediction. Given at *Rome*, at *St. Peters*, under the Fiſher's Ring, the Fourth of *January*, 1679. the Third year of Our Popedom. Signed *MARIUS SPINULA*; and on the outſide, *To Our Venerable Brother*, James *Biſhop of* Condom.

FINIS.

A Catalogue of Books Printed for *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's moſt Excellent Majeſty, for his Houſhold and Chappel, 1686.

Reflections upon the Anſwer to the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented &c.* Directed to the Anſwerer. *Quarto.*

Kalendarium Catholicum for the Year 1686. *Octavo.*

Papiſts Proteſting againſt *Proteſtant-Popery.* In Anſwer to a Diſcourſe Entituled, *A Papiſt not Miſ-repreſented by Proteſtants.* Being a Vindication of the *Papiſt Miſ-repreſented* and *Repreſented*, and the *Reflections* upon the Anſwer. *Quart.*

Copies of Two Papers Written by the late King *Charles* II. Together with a Paper Written by the late Dutcheſs of *York.* Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Folio.*

The Spirit of Chriſtianity. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Twelves.*

The firſt Sermon Preach'd before their Majeſties in *Engliſh* at *Windſor*, on the firſt *Sunday* of *October* 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. P. E.* Monk of the Holy Order of S. *Benedict*, and of the *Engliſh* Congregation. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Quarto.*

Second Sermon Preached before the King and Queen, and Queen Dowager, at Their Majeſties Chappel at St *James's*, *November* 1, 1685. By the Reverend Father *Dom. Ph. Ellis*, Monk of the Holy Order of S. *Benedict*, and of the *Engliſh* Congregation. Publiſhed by his Majeſty's Command. *Quarto.*

432.841.